

THE LIFE
AND
SPEECHES
OF
ABRAHAM LINCOLN,
AND
HANNIBAL HAMLIN

EDITED AND PUBLISHED BY
REUBEN VOSE,

NO. 45 MAIDEN LANE,

NEW YORK.

NEW YORK :
HILTON, GALLAHER & CO., PRINTERS,
24 & 26 ANN ST., N. Y.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2009 with funding from
Friends of the Lincoln Financial Collection in Indiana

THE LIFE
AND
SPEECHES
OF
ABRAHAM LINCOLN,
AND
HANNIBAL HAMLIN

EDITED AND PUBLISHED BY
REUBEN VOSE,

NO. 45 MAIDEN LANE,

NEW YORK.

NEW YORK :
HILTON, GALLAHER & CO., PRINTERS,
24 & 26 ANN ST., N. Y.

**Entered according to an act of Congress,
in the Year 1860, by**

R E U B E N V O S E ,

**In the Clerk's Office, of the District
Court of the United States, for the Southern
District of New York.**

PUBLISHER'S NOTICE

This book, with the exception of the publisher's notice and the jacket in which it is enclosed, is an exact reproduction, as far as it is possible to make it, of an original copy of a Vose, Life of Lincoln, in the library of the publishers—

**THE LINCOLN NATIONAL LIFE
FOUNDATION**

Fort Wayne, Indiana

1938

Abraham Lincoln was born in Hardin County, Kentucky, February 12, 1809, and is now 51 years old. He is of the race of the Massachusetts Lincolns, though his parents were of Quaker stock, that migrated from Pennsylvania to Virginia, whence his grandfather removed in 1781-2 to Kentucky, and was there surprised and killed by Indians while at work on his clearing. Like most pioneers, he left his family poor; and his son also died prematurely, leaving a widow and several children, including Abraham, then six years old. The family removed soon after to Southern Indiana, where Abraham grew to the stature of six feet and some inches, but enjoyed scarcely better opportunities for instruction than in Kentucky. Probably six months in all of the rudest sort of schooling comprehends the whole of his technical education. He was in turn a farm laborer, a common workman in a saw-mill, and a boatman on the Wabash and Mississippi rivers. Thus hard work and plenty of it, the rugged experiences of aspiring poverty, the wild sports and rude games of a newly and thinly peopled forest region—the education born of the log-cabin, the rifle, the axe, and the plow,

combined with the reflections of an original and vigorous mind, eager in the pursuit of knowledge by every available means, and developing a character of equal resource and firmness—made him the man he has since proved himself.

At 21, he pushed further West into Illinois, which has for the last thirty years been his home, living always near and for some years past in Springfield, the State Capital. He worked on a farm as a hired man the first year in Illinois; the next year he was clerk in a store; then volunteered for the Black Hawk war, and was chosen a captain by his company; the next year he was an unsuccessful candidate for the Legislature; he was chosen the next, and served four sessions with eminent usefulness and steadily increasing reputation; studied law meantime, and took his place at the bar; was early recognized as a most effective and convincing advocate before the People of Whig principles and the Protective policy, and of their illustrious embodiment, Henry Clay; was a Whig candidate for Election in nearly or quite every Presidential contest from 1836 to 1852 inclusive; was chosen to the XXXth Congress from the Central District of Illinois in 1846, and served to its close, but was not a candidate for re-election; and in 1849 measurably withdrew from politics and devoted himself to the practice of his profession until the Nebraska Iniquity of 1854 called him again into the political arena. He was the candidate of the Whigs for U. S.

Senator before the Legislature chosen that year ; but they were not a majority of the body ; so he declined and urged his friends to support Judge Trumbull, the candidate of the anti-Nebraska Democrats, who was thus elected

In the gallant and memorable Presidential contest of 1856. Mr. Lincoln's name headed the Fremont Electoral Ticket of Illinois. In 1858, he was unanimously designated by the Republican State Convention to succeed Mr. Douglas in the Senate, and thereupon canvassed the State against Mr. D. with an ability in which logic, art, eloquence, and thorough good-nature were alike conspicuous, and which gave him a national reputation. Mr. Douglas secured a predominance in the Legislature and was elected, though Mr. Lincoln had the larger popular vote, so that if the question had been decided by the majority of the people, the champion of Squatter Sovereignty and of indifference as regards Slavery extension would not now be a Senator from Illinois.

As a Presidential candidate, Mr. Lincoln enjoys peculiar advantages. While his position as a Republican renders him satisfactory to the most zealous member of the party, the moderation of his character, and the conservative tendencies of his mind, long approved and well known of all men in public life, commend him to every section of the Opposition. There is no good reason why Americans and Whigs, and in short all who are inspired rather by patriotism than by party

feeling, should not rally to his support. Republicans and Conservatives, those who dread the extension of Slavery, and those who dread the progress of Administrative and Legislative Corruption, may be assured that in him both these evils will find a stern and immovable antagonist and impassable barrier. At the same time as a Man of the People, raised by his own genius and integrity from the humblest to the highest position, having made for himself an honored name as a lawyer, an advocate, a popular orator, a statesman, and a Man, the industrious and intelligent masses of the country may well hail his nomination with a swelling tide of enthusiasm, if wild and prolonged outbursts at Chicago are the fitting prelude and beginning.

We need hardly say that the election of Mr. Lincoln, though it cannot be accomplished without arduous and persistent efforts, is eminently a "thing that can be done." The disruption of the Democratic party, now less likely to be repaired than before his nomination, the fact that he was put forward by one of the doubtful States, Illinois, and nominated in great measure by votes from two others, namely, Pennsylvania and New Jersey, the universal desire of the country to settle the vexatious Slavery question in accordance with the views of the Fathers—all these are powerful in behalf of the Chicago ticket. But, as we said, efforts must be made. The organization must be perfected in every State, in every county, in every dis-

strict. Tracts and newspapers must be disseminated. Public discussions must be held. The people must be animated, enlightened, inspired with a sense of the solemn duty resting on all patriotic citizens. Thus the great Victory may be achieved, and the country may be redeemed from the pernicious influence that are hurrying it to ruin. Americans! Republicans! Shall not all this be accomplished?

HANNIBAL HAMLIN.

Mr. Hamlin who was nominated May 19, by the Republican Convention at Chicago for Vice-President, was born in Paris, Oxford Co., Me., in Aug., 1809, and is now in the 51st year of his age. He is by profession a lawyer, but for the last twenty-four years has been, for much of the time, in political life. From 1836 to 1840 he was a member of the Legislature of Maine, and for three of those years he was Speaker of its House of Representatives. In 1843 he was elected a member of Congress, and re-elected for the following term. In 1847 he was again a member of the State Legislature, and the next year was chosen to fill a vacancy, occasioned by the death of John Fairfield, in the United States Senate. In 1851 he was re-elected for the full term in the same body, but resigned on being chosen Governor of Maine in 1857. In the same month he was again elected to the United States Senate for six years, which office he accepted, resigning the Gov-

ernorship. He is still a member of the Senate. This record is an evidence of the confidence with which he has always been regarded by his fellow citizens in Maine.

Up to the time of the passage of the the Kansas-Nebraska bill in 1854, Mr. Hamlin was a member of the Democratic party. That act he regarded as a proof that the party, with which he had been all his life connected, no longer deserved the name of Democratic, and was treacherous to the principles he had so long cherished. Thenceforward he gave his support of the Republican party, of which he has ever since continued a faithful and distinguished leader.

Mr. Hamlin is a man of dignified presence, of solid abilities, unflinching integrity, and great executive talent. Familiar with the business of legislation, he is peculiarly adapted, by the possession of all these qualities, to fill beneficially for the country, and to his own and to his party's honor, the high post for which he has been nominated, the name of HANNIBAL HAMLIN of Maine, is a fit second to that of ABRAHAM LINCOLN of Illinois.

Much has been said lately, of representative men—so much, indeed that an enterprising publisher has put forth a book of biographies, in which the lives of all our most noted politicians are sketched at length, and the world is given to understand that gentlemen who obtain political position are the high types of American civilization. But this is a cardinal mistake; and this book in question does not

contain a word of many of the real representative men of the nation. Abraham Lincoln's name, for instance, is omitted, from it, while such names as Cobb, Dallas, Orr, Lane, Brown, Botts and Wise, are treated with the most elaborate consideration.

Nevertheless, Mr. Lincoln surpasses all these as a personification of the distinctive genius of our country and its institutions. Whatever is peculiar in the history and development of America, whatever is foremost in its civilization, whatever is grand in its social and political structure finds its best expression in the career of such men as Abraham Lincoln. Our first and principal task as a nation has been to subdue the vast wilderness which has been given us as a heritage. To expel the savage, to fell the forest, to clear the field, to tame the soil, to construct the ways of intercourse and to convert the desert into a prosperous and blooming habitation, has been the work imposed upon us, and our highest triumphs consist in the success with which this has been accomplished. Our literature, art and science have as yet merely made a beginning; our achievements in war and diplomacy are comparatively insignificant; but the practical energy which within a few years has carried the civilization of the nineteenth century, in its highest forms, over an entire continent, commands and deserves the applause of the world. This has been our destiny, and future history will write it as our earliest distinction and glory.

I.

Now, the pioneers of the West have been the instruments of this success—men who have quitted the settled districts of the seaboard to reclaim the interior wilderness; who have taken their axes upon their shoulders to clear away the woods; who have put their hands to the plough to turn up the soil; who, freighting flat-boats with the wares of the villages, have carried them into the solitudes to supply the wants of the frontier; and in Abraham Lincoln we behold one of the most hardy and adventurous of these backwoodsmen. A pioneer, a woodcutter, a boatman and a farmer, he has, in each vocation, typified one grand and characteristic mission of our people, and become a representative man in the truest sense of the term.

Our country is not, however, distinguished alone for its stupendous physical progress, for those grand triumphs over nature which have sprinkled the whole continent with cities, and connected its remotest parts by railroads and telegraphs. It has also worked out for itself a peculiar social and political constitution. Placing, for the first time in the history of mankind, the controlling power of government in the hands of the whole people, it has constructed a vast fabric of society on that basis. It has said to all ranks and orders of men, here you are free; here you are equal in rights to each other; here the careers of life are open to every comer; men are thrown upon their own intrinsic manhood for their reliance, and it belongs to each one to become the architect of his

own fortunes. This unlimited freedom of action, though it has produced some social evils, has produced much greater good, and we do not believe that there is a nation on the globe in which the masses of the people are so prosperous, so intelligent, and so contented as they are in this nation. What more striking illustration of its effects could we have, than the rise of Mr. Lincoln to his present importance in the eyes of the world? Is he not pre-eminently the child of our free institutions? A poor orphan, without education or friends, by the labor of his hands, by the energy of his will, by the manliness and probity of his character, he raises himself to fortune and fame; a powerful party, which contains, to say the least, as much virtue and intelligence as any other, assigns him without intrigues or efforts of his own, the first place in its regards, making him the bearer of its standard in a momentous political conflict; and in a few months more we may see the once friendless boy the occupant of the Presidential chair. Thus the spirit of our institutions is strikingly embodied in his career, which is itself an admirable commentary on their excellence.

We have said that the opportunities of life were open to all men in this country; but in saying so we are not entirely accurate; for, unfortunately, there is a class of enslaved Africans among us which constitutes a sad exception. Slavery began to exist on this continent before we were a nation, and though it was regarded as a

temporary and transitorial thing, circumstances in the commercial history of the world gave to it gradually an unexpected and pernicious importance. It grew with our growth, until those who were interested in it came to control the political destinies of the country, and to run a course of rivalry even with our free people. Giving character to the civilization of the South, it has produced a serious conflict between it and the civilization of the North. The men who labor for themselves contend with the men who labor through slaves for the possession of the government and the planting of those immense territories at the West which are the seats of future empire. But here again Abraham Lincoln appears as a champion of the movement of freedom. Though born at the South, he has identified himself thoroughly with the cause of free labor, recommending its practice by his daily example, and commending its principles by his vigorous eloquence.

Could you have, then, a better representative man than Lincoln?

Having fully expressed our entire satisfaction with the nominations of the Chicago Convention, we are, of course, glad to have the candidates commended by others for whatever they may see in them worthy of praise. Yet we think that the Republican papers, anxious to secure the triumph of the party on the broad basis which it has adopted, are bound to consider the grounds of their approval and to give most prominence to those which are

best calculated to win the popular support, and especially those which will best obtain the good-will of such as are most essential to our success.

In this view we have been led to question the expediency of magnifying, as many do, the circumstance that Mr. Lincoln was a devoted follower of Henry Clay. To a very large and important part (we do not say a majority) of the Republican party this fact is very far from being a recommendation. Having been themselves conscientiously opposed to Mr. Clay's policy, and having always done their best to resist his schemes, and having in common with the great majority of the people of the United States rejoiced in the successive defeat and final overthrow of every one of those great measures of government to which Mr. Clay devoted himself, these persons are not prepared to surrender their own convictions by admitting, even by implication, that Mr. Lincoln is the better entitled to their suffrages on account of his having been a supporter of Mr. Clay's projects. All that they can be justly expected to do is to give him, as they are prepared to do if they may, a generous and hearty support in his present position, notwithstanding his former concurrence with Mr. Clay. They support him because he has left the ground that Mr. Clay occupied, of compromise and concession to slavery, and because he now manfully takes the stand of open opposition and unyielding resistance to all the

unjust demands and all the bold aggressions of the slave power.

We rejoice to co-operate with so large a portion of the former friends of Mr. Clay in maintaining this new position which Mr. Clay spent his last strength in resisting. But we cannot lose sight of the fact that another large portion of the supporters of Mr. Clay, both in the North and the South, are still the most impracticable of all the opponents of the Republican party, and the most desperate in their hostility to our cause. If it is expected that these men are to be conciliated to the support of the Republican ticket, nothing can be more futile than such a hope. Their natural instincts, their life-long habits, their social sympathies, bind them to the support of the great property interest of slavery and the prerogatives of so exclusive a caste as the slaveholders. There is no sentiment so strong among them as their hostility to the Republican cause and its leaders, and they would rather allow any other result to take place than to contribute to our triumph. It is idle to imagine that this deadly hostility is to be appeased by the mere fact that our candidate was a supporter of the Great Compromiser until he became convinced that the days of the compromise were past.

On the other hand, our needed resources are to be found, if at all, among those honest and patriotic democrats, who have supported democracy because it was the doctrine of liberty, and who are opening their eyes to the evidence that the

democratic party, as at present organized, is false to the interests of liberty and has become wholly devoted to slavery. Let it not be forgotten that every such man gained over from the enemy counts two in the election. And multitudes of such men may be gained or lost, as they shall see reason to believe that the Republican party is sincere in its adoption of the common platform, or to fear that it is managed to be made a Whig party, with an ulterior purpose of turning it to the revival of the politics of Henry Clay.

Mr. Bell, of Tennessee, has been put forth by a knot of timid people here at the North, as a man moderate in his opinion on the slavery question, and one who does not share in the extravagance of either North or South. Accordingly he is commended to the conservatives of the North, on that ground, with considerable earnestness. Take Bell, say his friends and you will have a safe President, who will refuse to agitate these dangerous questions, and give peace and harmony once more to our distracted Union.

At the same time, Bell's adherents at the South endeavor to further his hopeless cause on very different grounds. Bell is wholly with us, they say, on this slavery question. No fire-eater who clamors for a slave-code for the territories is more decided or extreme in his convictions as to the rights of slavery in the territories, than Bell is. He not only approves of slavery in its economical and social aspects, but he is eager to carry it into new regions,

and to maintain it there with the whole authority and force of the federal government. Toombs, Davis or Toucey are not more strenuous in the assertion of these views than Bell has been and is.

Such are the positions of the southern conservative prints, and, between them and the conservative prints of the North, we must say they are right. Mr. Bell shares in all the retrograde sentiments of the South. In his speech in the Senate on the compromise measures of 1850 he did not scruple to avow his approbation of slavery, and his desire to see it extended. He said.

“As to the lawfulness or sinfulness of the institution of slavery—whether frenzied or fanatic priests, or more learned and rational divines may preach, whatever they may affirm of Christian precepts, of moral and religious duties and responsibilities; whatever interpretation of the law of nature or of Almighty God they may announce; whatever doctrines or theories of the equality of human rights, and of the various races of mankind, diversified as they are by complexion, to physical formation and mental development, the disciples of a transcendental creed of any kind may hold or teach; however they may dogmatize upon this hypothesis, and declare it to be a violation of the law of nature by any one race, with whatever superiority of mental or physical faculties they may be endued, to subjugate those of an inferior race, and make them the instruments of improvement and ame-

liberation in their own condition, and in that of their masters and conquerors, in carrying forward the great work of civilization—until we shall be enlightened by revelation from a higher source than themselves, I must claim the privilege of interpreting the law of nature by which I see revealed in the history of mankind from the earliest period of recorded time, uncontradicted by Divine authority. I must interpret that law according to the prominent facts connected with this subject, as they have stood out in the past, and as they stand out before us at this day. Looking through the eyes of history, I have seen slavery or involuntary servitude the instrument and hand-maid of Hindoo, Egyptian, Assyrian, Jewish, Greek and Roman civilization. I have seen the institution recognized by the theocratic government of the Jews, the chosen depositaries of the Word of Life; by democratic Athens and Republican Rome. I have seen, upon the overthrow of Roman civilization by the savage hordes of the North, that these new masters of Western Europe, and their successors, adopted and continued to uphold the same institution, under various modifications adapted to the changing condition of both slave and master, and still under an advancing civilization, until a comparatively recent period. I see the same institution tolerated and maintained in Eastern Europe at this day. I see the native race of all British India at this moment bowing the neck under a system of quasi slavery. But, above

all, I have seen here on this continent and in these United States, the original lords of the soil subdued—some of them reduced to slavery, others expelled—driven out—and the remnant still in subordination; and all this under an interpretation of the law of nature which holds good at this day among our northern brethren; and I have yet in reserve that great fact to which I have already alluded—three millions of the African race, whose labor is subject to the will of masters, under such circumstances that their condition cannot be changed, though their masters should will it, without destruction alike to the interests and welfare of both master and slave. These are the lights by which I read and understand the law of nature.”

Mr. Bell, in the same speech, tried to show the society in which it existed, and he carried his argument to such an extent as to declare that he believed the prosperity and glory of the United States to be mainly due to our subjection of the Africans.

“Sir, making all due allowance for American enterprise and the energies of free labor under such a system of free government as we enjoy, I doubt whether the power and resources of the country would have attained more than half their present extraordinary proportions but for this so much reviled institution of slavery. Sir, your rich and varied commerce, external and internal; your navigation; your commercial marine, the nursery of the military; your ample revenues; the public

credit ; your manufactures, your rich, populous and splendid cities—all, all my trace to this institution, as to their well-spring, their present gigantic proportions—nourished and built up to their present amazing height and grandeur by the great staples of the South—the products of slave labor.

“ Yet slavery, in every form in which it has existed from the primitive period of organized society—from its earliest and patriarchal form to this time, in every quarter of the globe—and all its results, even the magnificent results of African slavery in the United States, are declared to be against the law of nature. Though contributing in a hundred various forms and modes, through a period of thousands of years, to the amelioration of the condition of mankind generally ; though sometimes abused, as all human institutions, even those of religion, are, still contributing to advance the cause of civilization ; though, if you please, having its origin in individual cupidity, still working out a general good ; yet slavery and all its beneficent results are pronounced against the will of God by those who claim a superior illumination upon the subject. This may be so ; but I must say that this conclusion, so confidently announced, is not arrived at in accordance with the Baconian method of reasoning by which we are taught that from a great many particular and well-established facts in the physical economy we may safely deduce a general law of physical nature, and so of morals and govern-

ment. It seems to my weak faculties that it is rather an arrogant and presumptuous arraignment of the ways of Providence, mysterious as we knew them to be, for feeble men to declare, that which has been permitted to exist and prosper from the beginning among men and nations, is contrary to his will.

The most graphic, and, we dare say, the most reliable historical sketch of "Old Abe Lincoln" that we have seen or heard is that which follows. It is embraced in the opening speech of Judge Douglas of the first joint debate between himself and "Old Abe," at Ottawa, Illinois, August 21, 1858, and reads:

In the remarks I have made upon this platform, and the position of Mr. Lincoln upon it, I mean personally nothing disrespectful or unkind to that gentleman. I have known him for nearly twenty-five years. There were many points of sympathy between us when we first got acquainted. We were both comparatively boys, and both struggling with poverty in a strangeland. I was a school teacher in the town of Winchester, and he a flourishing grocery keeper in the town of Salem. He was more successful in his occupation than I was in mine, and hence more fortunate in this world's goods. Lincoln is one of those peculiar men who perform with admirable skill everything which they undertake. I made as good a school teacher as I could, and when a cabinet-maker I made a good beadstead and table. although my old boss said I succeeded better with bureaus and secretaries than with any thing else ;

but I believe that Lincoln was always more successful in business than I, for his business enabled him to get into the Legislature. I met him there, however, and had a sympathy with him because of the uphill struggle we both had in life. He was then just as good at telling an anecdote as now. He could beat any of the boys wrestling or running a foot race, in pitching quoits or tossing a copper; could ruin more liquor than all the boys of the town together; and the dignity and impartiality with which he presided at a horse race or a fist fight excited the admiration and won the praise of everybody that was present and participated. I sympathized with him because he was struggling with difficulties, and so was I. Mr. Lincoln served with me in the Legislature in 1836, when we both retired, and he subsided or became submerged, and he was lost sight of as a public man for some years. In 1846, when Wilmot introduced his celebrated proviso, and the abolition tornado swept over the country, Lincoln again turned up, as a member of Congress from the Sangamon District. I was then in the Senate of the United States and was glad to welcome my old friend and companion. Whilst in Congress he distinguished himself by his opposition to the Mexican war, taking the side of the common enemy against his own country, and when he returned home he found that the indignation of the people followed him everywhere, and he was again submerged or obliged to retire into private life, forgotten by his former friends.

He came up again in 1854, just in time to make this abolition or black Republican platform, in company with Giddings. Lovejoy, Chase, and Fred, Douglas, for the Republican party to stand upon.

Now, the only points in all this statement of Judge Douglas, noticed by Mr. Lincoln on the occasion, were, the Judge's charges concerning the Mexican war, the Illinois abolition platform of 1854, and the grocery store. Touching the Mexican war, Mr. Lincoln explained that while he had opposed the preamble of the war bill declaring that war existed "by the act of Mexico," he had voted all the supplies. With regard to the said abolition platform, he had nothing to do with it, and did not entertain such sentiments; and with regard to his keeping a grocery store, Mr. Lincoln on the occasion referred to, and in reply to the aforesaid speech of Mr. Douglas, made the following correction, to wit:

"Now I pass on to consider one or two more of these little follies. The Judge is woefully at fault about his early friend Lincoln being a 'grocery keeper.' I don't know as it would have been a great sin if I had been, but he is mistaken. Lincoln never kept a grocery anywhere in the world. It is true that Lincoln did work the latter part of one winter, in a little stillhouse up at the head of a hollow. And so I think my friend the Judge is equally at fault when he charges me, at the time when I was in Congress, of having opposed our soldiers who were fighting in the Mexican war." &c.

The following sketch of Mr. Lincoln is from a publication devoted to the democratic party. If nothing more can be said of Mr. Lincoln, we think he may be elected.

**ABRAM LINCOLN, OF ILLINOIS,
THE REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE FOR THE PRESIDENCY.**

Abram Lincoln, the republican candidate for the Presidency in the campaign of 1860, is a native of Harden county, Kentucky. He was born February 12, 1809. His parents were born in Virginia, and were of very moderate circumstances. His paternal grandfather, Abram Lincoln, emigrated from Rockingham County, Virginia, to Kentucky about 1781-82, where, a year or two later, he was killed by Indians. His ancestors, who were respectable members of the society of Friends, went to Virginia from Berks county, Pennsylvania. Descendants from the same lineage still reside in the eastern part of Pennsylvania.

Abram Lincoln, the subject of this memoir, further removed from Kentucky to Spencer county, in Indiana, in 1816.

Mr. Lincoln received a limited education. In 1830 he removed to Illinois, and passed the first year in Macon county, engaged in agricultural pursuits. He next went to New Salem, at that time in Sagamon county, now Chenard County, where he remained about one year as a clerk in a store. About this time the Florida or Black Hawk war broke out, and on the call from the federal government for volunteers, a company was raised in Now

Salem, and Lincoln was elected captain. He served through this memorable campaign. On his return to Illinois in 1832, he became a candidate for the State Legislature, but was defeated. The next three succeeding biennial elections, he was elected to the Legislature by the Whig party. During his legislative term he studied law, and subsequently engaged practically in the profession at Springfield; but his practice at the bar did not withdraw his attention from politics, and for many years he was one of the leaders of the whig party in Illinois, and was on the electoral ticket in several Presidential campaigns. He was a disciple of Henry Clay, and exerted himself in his behalf in 1844, by making a tour of Illinois and advocating Clay's election to the Presidency. He was elected to Congress in 1846, and served until 1849.

While in Congress, the Wilmot proviso warfare was in progress, and which disturbed the peace and harmony of the country, until it shook the foundation of the country from its centre to its circumference. He voted forty-two times for the proviso. He was also active in connection with Seward, Chase, Giddings, and other abolitionists, in the agitation of that subject. He also opposed the Mexican war, and declared it unconstitutional and wrong, and voted against the bill granting 160 acres of land to the volunteers.

In the National Convention of 1848, of which he was a member, he advanced the nomination of General Taylor, and

sustained the nomination by a canvass of his own State. In 1852 he was efficient in his efforts for General Scott, and was considered by the whigs of Illinois and the Northwest as one of their own leaders. From 1849 to 1854 Mr. Lincoln was engaged in the practice of his profession.

In 1849 he was a candidate before the Illinois Legislature for the United States Senator, prior to which he stumped the State for the whigs. When the Legislature met, the democracy was in the majority, and General Shields, the democratic candidate was elected. In 1855 he was again the candidate of the whigs for United States Senator before the Legislature chosen that year ; but the democracy being in the majority, Lincoln was again defeated and Judge Trumbull, the democratic candidate, elected. In 1856 Mr. Lincoln's name headed the Fremont electoral ticket in Illinois. In 1858 it was the desire of the Illinois Republican State Committee to have Mr. Lincoln succeed Douglas in the United States Senate, and to effect this he stumped the State for the republicans ; and it was during this campaign that Mr. Lincoln made the best political speeches of his life, and from which the people of the Union will at once read his sentiments on the great questions of the day. He is a tariff man ; in favor of a protective policy ; opposed to the Dred Scott decision, urging as an especial reason for his position that it deprives the negro of the rights of that clause in the constitution of the United States which guarantees to the citizens of

each State all the rights, privileges and immunities of the several States.

In the campaign in Illinois in 1858, when he stumped the State in opposition to Douglas, he showed himself an adept in political strategy, and suited his speeches to the locality in which he spoke. In one county he would preach one set of principles, and a different and contradictory set in other counties. He is no orator, statesman or legislator, but is classed among the stump speakers of the Tom Ford stamp.

In personal appearance Mr. Lincoln, or, as he is more familiarly termed among those who know him best, "Old Uncle Abe," is long, lean and wiry. In motion he has a great deal of the elasticity and awkwardness which indicate the rough training of his early life, and his conversation savors strongly of Western idioms and pronunciation. His height is six feet three inches. His complexion is about that of an octoroon; his face, without being by any means beautiful, is gentle looking, and good humor seems to lurk in every corner of its innumerable angles. He has dark hair tinged with gray, a good forehead, small eyes, a long penetrating nose with nostrils such as Napoleon always liked to find in his best generals, because they indicated a long head and clear thoughts; and a mouth, which, aside from being of magnificent proportions, is probably the most expressive feature of his face.

As a speaker he is ready, precise and fluent. His manner before a popular assembly is as he pleases to make it being

either superatively ludicrous or very impressive. He employs but little gesticulation, but when he desires to make a point, produces a shrug of his shoulders, an elevation of his eyebrows, a depression of his mouth and a general malformation of countenance so comically awkward that it never fails to "bring down the house." His enunciation is slow and emphatic and his voice, though sharp and powerful, at times has a frequent tendency to dwindle into a shrill and unpleasant sound, but as before stated, the peculiar characteristic of his features, the frequent contortions of which excite a merriment his words could not produce.

Mr. Lincoln is the author of the basis upon which Seward formed his "irrepressible conflict" platform, as will be seen from subjoined extracts from his speeches. Lincoln's "irrepressible conflict" sentiments were uttered in a speech delivered at Springfield Illinois, June 17, 1858, and Seward's speech on the same topic in October, 1858. Mr. Lincoln, in his speech at Springfield, Illinois, on the 17th of June, 1858, said:—

In my opinion it will not cease—the slavery agitation—Ed.)—until a crisis shall have been reached and passed. "A house divided against itself cannot stand" I believe this government cannot endure permanently, half slave, half free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved—I do not expect the house to fall, but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing, or all the other.

Either the opponents of slavery will arrest the further spread of it, and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction; or its advocates will push it forward, till it shall become alike lawful in all the States—old as well as new—North as well as South.

In another speech at Chicago, on the 16th July, 1858, he said:—

“I have always hated slavery, I think, as much as any abolitionist. I have been an old line whig. I have always hated it, and I always believed it in course of ultimate extinction. If I were in Congress, and a vote should come up whether slavery should be prohibited in a new Territory, in spite of the Dred Scott decision, I would vote that it should.”

In another speech at Springfield, Ill., July 17, 1858, he said:—

“I nevertheless did mean to go on the banks of the Ohio and throw missiles into Kentucky, to disturb them in their domestic institutions.”

In another speech at Galesburgh, October 7, 1858, he said:—

“I believe that the right of property in a slave is not distinctly and expressly affirmed in the constitution.”

Mr. Lincoln was comparatively unknown to the people of this section of the Union until during the past winter, when he made a tour of the middle and New England States, delivering political stump speeches at twenty-five cents *per capita* admission. He delivered a speech in the

Cooper Institute, which he evidently prepared for the newspapers; but on the night of the lecture he interspersed it with radical republican sentiments fully as treasonable as Seward's "irrepressible conflict," doctrine. He realized two hundred dollars from this lecture. He next visited Connecticut, and stumped that State for the republicans. The fact of his charging an admission fee to his lectures—a thing unknown before in our political history—was the subject of comment among leading republicans, and in several instances received the rebuke which such political showmanship deserved.

THE PLATFORM.

We give below the platform of the Republican party, adopted at its first National Convention at Philadelphia, in 1856, and that adopted by the delegates of the same party at Chicago, two days since for 1860 :

PLATFORM OF 1860.

RESOLVED, That we, the delegated representatives of the Republican Electors of the United States, in Convention assembled, in the discharge of the duty we owe to our constituents and our country, unite in the following declarations:

FIRST: That the history of the nation during the last four years has fully established the propriety and necessity of the organization and perpetuation of the Republican party, and that the causes which called it into existence are permanent in

their nature, and now more than ever before demand its peaceful and constitutional triumph.

SECOND : That the maintenance of the principles promulgated in the Declaration of Independence, and embodied in the Federal Constitution, is essential to the preservation of our republican institutions ; that the Federal Constitution, the rights of the States, and the Union of the States, must and shall be preserved ; and that we reassert " these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal ; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights ; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

THIRD : That to the Union of the States this nation owes its unprecedented increase in population ; its surprising development of material resources ; its rapid augmentation of wealth ; its happiness at home and its honor abroad ; and we hold in abhorrence all schemes for disunion, come from whatever source they may ; and we congratulate the country that no Republican Member of Congress has uttered or countenanced a threat of disunion, so often made by Democratic Members of Congress without rebuke and with applause from their political associates ; and we denounce those threats of disunion, in case of a popular overthrow of their ascendancy, as denying the vital

principles of a free Government, and as an avowal of contemplated treason, which it is the imperative duty of an indignant people strongly to rebuke and forever silence.

FOURTH: That the maintenance inviolate of the rights of the States, and especially the right of each State to order and control its own domestic institutions, according to its own judgment exclusively, is essential to that balance of power on which the perfection and endurance of political faith depends, and we denounce the lawless invasion by armed force of any State or Territory, no matter under what pretext, as among the gravest of crimes.

FIFTH: That the present Democratic Administration has far exceeded our worst apprehensions in its measureless subserviency to the exactions of a sectional interest, as is especially evident in its desperate exertions to force the infamous Lecompton Constitution upon the protesting people of Kansas—in construing the personal relation between master and servant to involve an unqualified property in persons—in its attempted enforcement everywhere, on land and sea, through the intervention of Congress and the Federal Courts of the extreme pretensions of a purely local interest, and in its general and unvarying abuse of the power entrusted to it by a confiding people.

SIXTH: That the people justly view with alarm the reckless extravagance which pervades every department of the Federal

Government ; that a return to rigid economy and accountability is indispensable to arrest the system of plunder of the public treasury by favored partisans ; while the recent startling developments of fraud and corruption at the Federal Metropolis, show that an entire change of administration is imperatively demanded.

SEVENTH : That the new dogma that the Constitution of its own force carries Slavery into any or all the Territories of the United States is a dangerous political heresy, at variance with the explicit provisions of that instrument itself, with contemporaneous exposition, and with legislative and judicial precedent, is revolutionary in its tendency and subversive of the peace and harmony of the country.

EIGHTH : That the normal condition of all the territory of the United States is that of Freedom ; that as our republican fathers when they had abolished Slavery in all our national territory, ordained that no person should be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without the process of law, it becomes our duty, by legislation, whenever such legislation is necessary, to maintain this provision of the Constitution against all attempts to violate it ; and we deny the authority of Congress, of a Territorial Legislature, or of any individuals, to give legal existence to Slavery in any Territory of the United States.

NINTH : That we brand the recent reopening of the African slave-trade, under the cover of our national flag, aided by perversions of judicial power, as a crime

against humanity, a burning shame to our country and age, and we call upon our Congress to take prompt and efficient measures for the total and final suppression of that execrable traffic.

TENTH: That in the recent vetoes by their Federal Governors of the acts of the Legislatures of Kansas and Nebraska, prohibiting Slavery in those Territories, we find a practical illustration of the boasted Democratic principle of non-intervention and Popular Sovereignty, embodied in the Kansas and Nebraska bill, and a denunciation of the deception and fraud involved therein.

ELEVENTH: That Kansas should of right be immediately admitted as a State under the Constitution recently formed and adopted by her people, and accepted by the House of Representatives.

TWELFTH: That while providing revenue for the support of the General Government by duties upon imposts, sound policy requires such an adjustment of these imposts as to encourage the developement of the industrial interest of the whole country, and we commend that policy of national exchanges which secures to the working-men liberal wages, to agriculture remunerating prices, to mechanics and manufacturers an adequate reward for their skill, labor and enterprise, and to the nation commercial prosperity and independence.

THIRTEENTH: That we protest against any sale or alienation to others of the public lands held by actual settlers, and

against any view of the free Homestead policy which regards the settlers as paupers or supplicants for public bounty, and we demand the passage by Congress of the complete and satisfactory Homestead measure which has already passed the House.

FOURTEENTH: That the Republican party is opposed to any change in our Naturalization laws, or any State legislation by which the rights of citizenship hitherto accorded to immigrants from foreign lands shall be abridged or impaired ; and in favor of giving a full and efficient protection to the rights of all classes of citizens, whether native or naturalized, both at home or abroad.

FIFTEENTH: That appropriations by Congress for River and Harbor Improvements of a national character, required for the accommodation and security of an existing Commerce, are authorized by the Constitution and justified by an obligation of the Government to protect the lives and property of its citizens.

SIXTEENTH: That a railroad to the Pacific Ocean is imperatively demanded by the interests of the whole country ; that the Federal Government ought to render immediate and efficient aid in its construction, and that as preliminary thereto, a daily overland mail should be promptly established.

SEVENTEENTH : Finally, having thus set forth our distinctive principles and views we invite the co-operation of all citizens, however differing on other questions, who

substantially agree with us in their affirmation and support.

PLATFORM OF 1856.

This Convention of Delegates, assembled in pursuance of a call addressed to the people of the United States, without regard to past political differences or divisions, who are opposed to the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, to the policy of the present Administration, to the extension of Slavery into Free Territory; in favor of admitting Kansas as a Free State, of restoring the action of the Federal Government to the principles of Washington and Jefferson, and who purpose to unite in presenting candidates for the offices of President and Vice-President, do resolve as follows :

RESOLVED, That the maintenance of the principles promulgated in the Declaration of Independence and embodied in the Federal Constitution is essential to the preservation of our republican institutions, and that the Federal Constitution, the rights of the States, and the Union of the States, shall be preserved.

RESOLVED, That with our republican fathers we hold it to be a self-evident truth, that all men are endowed with the inalienable rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and that the primary object and ulterior designs of our Federal Government were, to secure these rights to all persons within its exclusive jurisdiction; that, as our republican fathers, when they had abolished Slavery

in all our National Territory, ordained that no person should be deprived of life, liberty or property, without due process of law, it becomes our duty to maintain this provision of the Constitution against all attempts to violate it for the purpose of establishing Slavery in any Territory of the United States, by positive legislation, prohibiting its existence or extension therein. That we deny the authority of Congress, of a Territorial Legislature, of any individual or association of individuals, to give legal existence to Slavery in any Territory of the United States, while the present Constitution shall be maintained.

RESOLVED, That the Constitution confers upon Congress sovereign power over the Territories of the United States for their government, and that in the exercise of this power it is both the right and the duty of Congress to prohibit in the Territories those twin relics of barbarism—Polygamy and Slavery.

RESOLVED, That while the Constitution of the United States was ordained and established by the people in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, and secure the blessings of liberty, and contains ample provisions for the protection of the life, liberty and property of every citizen, the dearest constitutional rights of the people of Kansas have been fraudulently and violently taken from them—their territory has been invaded by an armed force—

spurious and pretended legislative, judicial and executive officers have been set over them. by whose usurped authority, sustained by the military power of the Government, tyrannical and unconstitutional laws have been enacted and enforced—the rights of the people to keep and bear arms have been infringed—test oaths of an extraordinary and entangling nature have been imposed, as a condition of exercising the right of suffrage and holding office—the right of an accused person to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury has been denied—the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures has been violated—they have been deprived of life, liberty and property without due process of law—that the freedom of speech and of the press has been abridged—the right to choose their representatives has been made of no effect—murders, robberies and arsons have been instigated and encouraged, and the offenders have been allowed to go unpunished—that all these things have been done with the knowledge, sanction and procurement of the present Administration, and that for this high crime against the Constitution, the Union, and Humanity, we arraign the Administration, the President, his advisers, agents, supporters, apologists and accessories, either before or after the facts, before the country and before the world, and that it is our fixed purpose to bring the actual perpetrators of these atrocious

outrages, and their accomplices, to a sure and condign punishment hereafter.

RESOLVED, That Kansas should be immediately admitted as a State of the Union, with her present free Constitution, as at once the most effectual way of securing to her citizens the enjoyment of the rights and privileges to which they are entitled, and of ending the civil strife now raging in her territory.

RESOLVED, That the highwayman's plea, that "might makes right," embodied in the Ostend Circular, was in every respect unworthy of American diplomacy, and would bring shame and dishonor upon any Government or people that gave it their sanction.

RESOLVED, That a railroad to the Pacific Ocean by the most central and practicable route, is imperatively demanded by the interests of the whole country; and that the Federal Government ought to render immediate and efficient aid in its construction; and, as an auxiliary thereto, the immediate construction of an emigrant route on the line of the railroad.

RESOLVED, That appropriations by Congress for the improvement of rivers and harbors, of a national character, required for the accommodation and security of our existing commerce, are authorized by the Constitution, and justified by the obligation of Government to protect the lives and property of its citizens.

RESOLVED, That we invite the affiliation and co-operation of freemen of all parties, however differing from us in other re-

spects, in support of the principles herein declared ; and, believing that the spirit of our institutions, as well as the Constitution of our country, guarantee liberty of conscience and equality of rights among citizens, we oppose all legislation impairing their security.

The difference between these platforms is precisely the difference which the lapse of time has rendered inevitable. The virtual attack upon the integrity of the Union in the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and the attempt by force of Arms and outrages hitherto unknown in any civilized country, not in a state of acknowledged civil war, to force Slavery upon Kansas, crystallized the elements of opposition into a vigorous and earnest party in 1856, which appealed to the country for support. But it appealed without success. The Federal Government, in the intervening four years, has continued in the hands of the party under whose auspices this alarming attempt to subvert the character and purpose of the Constitution had been made. It has abated in no degree its determined efforts to oppress the free labor of the North, and to uphold and extend a sectional interest founded upon a radical denial of the rights of man ; it has avowed this not simply as its guiding motive in a single case, but as a fixed principle of government, applicable at all times and everywhere to any Territory now belonging to, or hereafter to be acquired by the United States ; it has maintained the sublime

truths of the Declaration of Independence to be glittering generalities impossible of universal application to human society ; and it has threatened that any successful establishment of Republican principles would be followed by a dissolution of the States. The Convention at Chicago, therefore, came together under new circumstances, and in these changed relations. The Republican party at Philadelphia, in 1856, confronted a possible temporary evil : in 1860 it stands face to face with an organized despotism which announces its malgovernment and misgovernment to be founded on immutable principles of uniform application. Whereas, therefore, the platform of 1856 is mainly devoted to the question of Kansas, the platform of 1860 covers a broader ground, and rests on the deep-rooted principles of a true democratic government, by which the aggressions of the Slave-Power and the turpitude and treachery of pretended Democrats shall be overcome, whether in Kansas or any other Territory ; whether on the land or on the sea ; whether it be to open the virgin soil of the West and South to the introduction of slaves from Chesapeake Bay or the Coast of Guinea, to the virtual exclusion of free men and free labor.

The platform of 1860 differs from that of 1856 in several other particulars

While it emphatically condemns the extension of Slavery, it carefully affirms the right of each State to order and control its own domestic institutions.

It proposes such an adjustment of the

Tariff that while the needful revenue is raised for the support of the Government, the industrial interests of the country shall be developed for the benefit of the working-man, the farmer, the mechanic and the artisan.

It demands that the Public Lands of the country shall be held for the benefit of the tillers of the soil, and maintains that the squatter who has reclaimed a farm from the wilderness shall be sovereign thereof, and shall not be dispossessed.

It opposes any change in the Naturalization laws, whether by Federal or State legislation, by which there shall be any abridgement of the rights of citizenship hitherto accorded to immigrants from other lands.

It favors a railroad from Ocean to Ocean, and asks for a daily overland mail to connect the two sides of the continent as a preliminary step to the more perfect communication.

The party providing thus carefully for all the best and highest interests of the people ; pledging itself to a pure and economical administration of the Government ; called into existence by the despotic rule of an unscrupulous aristocracy, and compressed into a permanent organization by a persistent enforcement of that rule, threatening to subvert the most cherished rights of man and to defeat the end and aim of a Republican Government—this party appeals to the people from the best and loftiest motives, and has a right to reckon on success.

MR. HAMLIN'S SPEECH.

The following is the speech of Mr. Hamlin :

FRIENDS AND FELLOW-CITIZENS : Concurring with you fully in the great principles which have united us in political association, I am pleased to meet you on this occasion, and I unite my voice with yours most cordially in a tribute to a common cause. You have assembled to congratulate each other upon the doings of our recent Convention in Chicago, the result of which has come to us over the telegraph wires. Of that position which has been assigned to me, you will allow me to say, that while I feel profoundly grateful for the honor it confers, and am duly sensible of the obligations it imposes, it was neither sought, expected, or even desired. But as it has come unsolicited, it leaves me no alternative but to accept the responsibilities which attach to it, with an earnest hope and endeavor, that a cause more important than any man, will receive no detriment at my hands. But you have come to pay a tribute to our standard-bearer, who has been taken from the Great West, where the star of empire is culminating, if it has not already culminated ; a man of comprehensive and vigorous intellect, and fully equal to the position designated. The architect of his own fortune, he comes to us most emphatically a representative man ; not only a representative man as an able and earnest exponent of Republican principles, but as identified with the laboring and industrial classes Having

from early life to the maturity of manhood, devoted himself to physical labor, he can, as he does, but feel a keener sense of the rights of labor. He stands before the country, too, with a high moral character, upon which even a suspicion was never breathed, and with a political integrity above reproach. The objects desired by the Republicans in the pending election, and the obligations imposed upon our candidate, are, to bring back the Government to the principles and practices of its fathers and founders, and to administer it in the light of their wisdom and example ; to aid our commerce, to send it out upon distant seas, and to prepare for it havens in its distress and on its return; to infuse new life and energy into all the productive and industrial pursuits of the whole country, for we must not forget that the prosperity of every country must repose upon productive industry—labor it is, and labor alone, that builds and navigates our ships, delves in our mines, makes music in the workshops, clears away the forests, and makes the hillside blossom as the rose. It maintains our Government and upholds the world in its prosperity and advancement. Surely, then; it should challenge and demand its rights of the Government it thus sustains. To preserve the integrity of the Union, with the full and just rights of all the States, the States themselves not interfering with the principles of Liberty and Humanity in the Territories of the United States, outside of their own juris-

diction, and to preserve our original territorial domain for the homesteads of the free—these are the great principles which we have united to sustain and advance. That done, our Government will remain a blessing to all, and our country a refuge in which the man of every creed and every clime may enjoy the securities and privileges of institutions of Freedom, regulated only by law.

The Effect of the Nomination.

THE WAY THE NOMINATION WAS RECEIVED IN NEW YORK.

Upon the reception of the news of the nomination of Lincoln by the Chicago Convention, the Young Men's Republican Committee caused one hundred guns to be fired in the Park in commemoration of the event. After the young men's salute had been fired, the General Committee caused another hundred guns to be fired, in order to show their approbation of the nomination. There was quite a crowd collected in the Park to witness the firing.

There was also one hundred guns fired in Hamilton Square, and one hundred in Union Square, to express the joy of the republicans at the news from Chicago.

RATIFICATION MEETING AT STUYVESANT INSTITUTE.

A meeting was held last evening by the Young men's Republican Union, in the Stuyvesant Institute, to ratify the nominations of Abram Lincoln and Hannibal

Hamlin, as the candidates for President and Vice President of the United States. Four or five hundred were probably present during the evening, but the crowd was continually dropping in and out, and at no one time exceeded over two hundred persons.

The Chair was occupied by Mr. C. Braimard. Speeches were made by a Mr. E. F. Shepard, Mr. Center and others, almost the entire burden of which was the expression of disappointment that Wm. H. Seward had been deprived of the nomination. The belief was strongly expressed, however, that the present would prove a strong team, and that the republican party, which in 1856 was, so to speak, merely the gristle of a complete organization, was now a fully developed bone, possessing all the elements of strength and resistance. The Democratic party had gone to the dogs. One portion was travelling one way, the other in an opposite direction, and there was no probability that it would ever again be welded together sufficiently strong to contend against the well combined forces of republicanism. The issue was the same now as in 1856—no more slavery in the Territories—and the men who had been selected as the standard bearers would carry them through the conflict to certain victory.

Mr. McCLINTOCK presented the following resolutions, which were unanimously adopted:—

1. Resolved, That the young Men's Republican Union responds with alacrity and

unfeigned satisfaction to the nominations of the Chicago Convention.

2. Resolved, that in Abram Lincoln of Illinois, we have a staunch and consistent representative of the principles of the great republican party, a leader worthy and incorruptible, of whose ability we have abundant proof, and whose patriotism none can question.

3. Resolved, that Hannibal Hamlin, of Maine, is eminently deserving the high position assigned him by the Convention, and will rally the republican hosts in the East, no less effectively than his illustrious associate will be sure to do in the West.

4. Resolved, That we fling our banner to the breeze inscribed with the names of "Lincoln and Hamlin," confident that with such a ticket there can be no such word as fail.

A gentleman in the audience offered the following, which was also accepted:—

Resolved, That the hearty thanks of this association are due, and tendered to the delegates from this city to the Chicago Convention, for their unwavering and untiring support of the greatest and noblest statesman in the country—William H. Seward.

Three cheers were here proposed for Mr. Seward, but none were given. Indeed, little enthusiasm seems to have been manifested during the entire evening, and after a few remarks from different individuals the meeting adjourned.

RATIFICATION MEETING OF THE CENTRAL REPUBLICAN CAMPAIGN CLUB.

A meeting of the above organization was held at its rooms, 722 Broadway, May 20, to ratify the nomination of Lincoln and Hamlin. About fifty persons were present. The chair was occupied by Daniel Ullman, and speeches were made by A. F. Dow, John W. Horton, John Longtree, A. C. Hills and others, consisting chiefly of well digested abuse of James Buchanan, mingled cheers and regrets for Seward, and eulogy for Lincoln and Hamlin. The latter, however, were exceedingly meager, for few of the speakers seemed to be well enough posted in regard to their political attributes to handle the subject with either force or efficiency. The following resolution was adopted :

Resolved, That this club will cheerfully support and heartily sustain Abram Lincoln as President, and Hannibal Hamlin as Vice President of the United States, believing that they will faithfully sustain and energetically support the cardinal principles of the Republican party.

Reports were also received from several of the wards in the city where ratification meetings had been held during the evening, every one of which, as far as we learned, expressed deep regret at the failure of William H. Seward to obtain the nomination. As one of the gentlemen pertinently remarked, "Seward had shaken the bush, but Lincoln had caught the bird."

A gentleman who was among a number

of others that went to Springfield, after the adjournment of the Chicago Convention, to call upon the Republican candidate for the Presidency, has described the visit in a private communication to us, from which we make the following extract,

"It had been reported by some of Mr. Lincoln's political enemies that he was a man who lived in the 'lowest hoosier style,' and I thought I would see for myself. Accordingly, as soon as the business of the Convention was closed, I took the cars for Springfield. I found Mr. Lincoln living in a handsome, but not pretentious, double two-story frame house, having a wide hall running through the centre, with parlors on both sides, neatly, but not ostentatiously, furnished. It was just such a dwelling as a majority of the well-to-do residents of those fine western towns occupy. Every thing about it had a look of comfort and independence. The library I remarked in passing, particularly, and I was pleased to see long rows of books, which told of the scholarly tastes and culture of the family.

"Lincoln received us with great, and to me, surprising urbanity. I had seen him before in New York, and brought with me an impression of his awkward and ungainly manner; but in his own house, where he doubtless feels himself freer than in the strange New York circles, he had thrown this off, and appeared easy, if not graceful. He is, as you know, a tall, lank man, with a long neck, and his ordinary movements are unusually angular, even

out west. As soon, however, as he gets interested in conversation, his face lights up and his attitudes and gestures assume a certain dignity and impressiveness. His conversation is fluent, agreeable and polite. You see at once from it that he is a man of decided and original character.—His views are all his own; such as he has worked out from a patient and varied scrutiny of life, and not such as he has learned from others. Yet he cannot be called opinionated. He listens to others like one eager to learn, and his replies evince at the same time both modesty and self-reliance. I should say that sound common sense was the principal quality of his mind, although at times a striking phrase or word reveals a peculiar vein of thought. He tells a story well, with a strong idiomatic smack, and seems to relish humor both in himself and others. Our conversation was mainly political, but of a general nature. One thing Mr. Lincoln remarked which I will venture to repeat. He said that in the coming presidential canvass he was wholly uncommitted to any cabals or cliques, and that he meant to keep himself free from them, and from all pledges and promises.

“I had the pleasure, also, of a brief interview with Mrs. Lincoln, and, in the circumstances of these persons, I trust I am not trespassing on the sanctities of private life in saying a word in regard to that lady. Whatever of awkwardness may be ascribed to her husband, there is none of it in her. On the contrary, she is quite a

L

pattern of lady-like courtesy and polish. She converses with freedom and grace, and is thoroughly *au fait* in all the little amenities of society. Mrs. Lincoln belongs by the mother's side, to the Preston family of Kentucky, has received a liberal and refined education, and should she ever reach it, will adorn the White House. She is, I am told, a strict and consistent member of the Presbyterian Church.

"Not a man of us who saw Mr. Lincoln but was impressed by his ability and character. In illustration of the last let me mention one or two things, which your readers, I think, will be pleased to hear. Mr. Lincoln's early life, as you know, was passed in the roughest kind of experience on the frontier, and among the roughest sort of people. Yet I have been told that, in the face of all these influences, he is a strictly temperate man, never using wine or strong drink; and stranger still, he does not 'twist the filthy weed,' nor smoke, nor use profane language of any kind. When we consider how common these vices are all over the country, particularly in the West, it must be admitted that it exhibits no little strength of character to have refrained from them.

"Mr. Lincoln is popular with his friends and neighbors; the habitual equity of his mind points him out as a peace-maker and composer of difficulties; his integrity is proverbial; and his legal abilities are regarded as of the highest order. The *soubriquet* of 'Honest old Abe,' has been won by years of upright conduct, and is the

popular homage to his probity. He carries the marks of honesty in his face and entire deportment.

“I am the more convinced by this personal intercourse with Mr. Lincoln that the action of our Convention was altogether judicious and proper.”

SPEECH OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN,

OF ILLINOIS,

Delivered at the Cooper Institute, Monday,
Feb. 27, 1860.

MR. PRESIDENT AND FELLOW-CITIZENS OF NEW YORK : The facts with which I shall deal this evening are mainly old and familiar ; nor is there anything new in the general use I shall make of them. If there shall be any novelty, it will be in the mode of presenting the facts, and the inferences and observations following that presentation.

In his speech last autumn, at Columbus, Ohio, as reported in "The New York Times," Senator Douglas said :

" Our fathers, when they framed the Government under which we live, understood this question just as well, and even better, than we do now."

I fully indorse this, and I adopt it as a text for this discourse. I so adopt it because it furnishes a precise and an agreed starting point for a discussion between Republicans and that wing of Democracy headed by Senator Douglas. It simply leaves the inquiry : " What was the understanding those fathers had of the question mentioned ?"

What is the frame of Government under which we live ?

The answer must be : " The Constitution of the United States." That Constitution consists of the original, framed in 1787 (and under which the present Government first went into operation), and

twelve subsequently framed amendments, the first ten of which were framed in 1789.

Who were our fathers that framed the Constitution? I suppose the "thirty-nine" who signed the original instrument may be fairly called our fathers who framed that part of the present Government. It is almost exactly true to say they framed it, and it is altogether true to say they fairly represented the opinion and sentiment of the whole nation at that time. Their names, being familiar to nearly all, and accessible to quite all, need not now be repeated.

I take these "thirty-nine," for the present, as being "our fathers who framed the Government under which we live."

What is the question which, according to the text, those fathers understood just as well, and even better than we do now.

It is this: Does the proper division of local from federal authority, or anything, in the Constitution, forbid our Federal Government to control as to slavery in our Federal Territories?

Upon this Douglas holds the affirmative, and Republicans the negative. This affirmative and denial form an issue; and this issue—this question—is precisely what the text declares our fathers understood better than we.

Let us now inquire whether the "thirty-nine," or any of them, ever acted upon this question; and if they did, how they

acted upon it—how they expressed that better understanding.

In 1784—three years before the Constitution—the United States then owning the Northwestern Territory, and no other—the Congress of the Confederation had before them the question of prohibiting slavery in that Territory; and four of the “thirty-nine,” who afterward framed the Constitution were in that Congress, and voted on that question. Of these, Roger Sherman, Thomas Mifflin, and Hugh Williamson voted for the prohibition—thus showing that, in their understanding, no line dividing local from federal authority, nor anything else, properly forbade the Federal Government to control as to slavery in federal territory. The other of the four—James McHenry—voted against the prohibition, showing that, for some cause, he thought it improper to vote for it.

In 1787, still before the Constitution, but while the Convention was in session framing it, and while the Northwestern Territory still was the only territory owned by the United States—the same question of prohibiting slavery in the territory again came before the Congress of the Confederation; and three more of the “thirty-nine” who afterward signed the Constitution, were in that Congress, and voted on the question. They were William Blount, William Few and Abraham Baldwin; and they all voted for the prohibition—thus showing that, in their understanding, no line dividing local from

federal authority, nor anything else, properly forbids the Federal Government to control as to slavery in federal territory. This time the prohibition became a law, being part of what is now well known as the Ordinance of '87.

The question of federal control of slavery in the territories, seems not to have been directly before the Convention which framed the original Constitution; and hence it is not recorded that the "thirty-nine" or any of them, while engaged on that instrument, expressed any opinion on that precise question.

In 1789, by the first Congress which sat under the Constitution, an act was passed to enforce the Ordinance of '87, including the prohibition of slavery in the Northwestern Territory. The bill for this act was reported by one of the "thirty-nine," Thomas Fitzsimmons, then a member of the House of Representatives from Pennsylvania. It went through all its stages without a word of opposition, and finally passed both branches without yeas and nays, which is equivalent to an unanimous passage. In this Congress there were sixteen of the "thirty-nine" fathers who framed the original Constitution. They were John Langdon, Nicholas Gilman, Wm. S. Johnson, Roger Sherman, Robert Morris, Thos. Fitzsimmons, William Few, Abraham Baldwin, Rufus King, William Patterson, George Clymer, Richard Bassett, George Read, Pierce Butler, Daniel Carroll, James Madison.

This shows that, in their understand-

ing, no line dividing local from federal authority, nor anything in the Constitution, properly forbade Congress to prohibit slavery in the federal territory ; else both their fidelity to correct principle, and their oath to support the Constitution, would have constrained them to oppose the prohibition.

Again, George Washington, another of the "thirty-nine," was then President of the United States, and, as such, approved and signed the bill, thus completing its validity as a law, and thus showing that, in his understanding, no line dividing local from federal authority, nor anything in the Constitution, forbade the Federal Government to control as to slavery in federal territory.

No great while after the adoption of the original Constitution, North Carolina ceded to the Federal Government the country now constituting the State of Tennessee ; and a few years later Georgia ceded that which now constitutes the States of Mississippi and Alabama. In both deeds of cession it was made a condition by the ceding States that the Federal Government should not prohibit slavery in the ceded country. Besides this, slavery was then actually in the ceded country. Under these circumstances, Congress, on taking charge of these countries, did not absolutely prohibit slavery within them. But they did interfere with it—take control of it—even there, to a certain extent. In 1798 Congress organized the Territory of Mississippi. In the act of organization

they prohibited the bringing of slaves into the Territory, from any place without the United States, by fine and giving freedom to slaves so brought. This act passed both branches of Congress without yeas and nays. In that Congress were three of the "thirty-nine" who framed the original Constitution. They were John Langdon, George Read and Abraham Baldwin. They all, probably, voted for it. Certainly they would have placed their opposition to it upon record, if, in their understanding, any line dividing local from federal authority, or anything in the Constitution, properly forbade the Federal Government to control as to slavery in federal territory.

In 1803, the Federal Government purchased the Louisiana country. Our former territorial acquisitions came from certain of our own States ; but this Louisiana country was acquired from a foreign nation. In 1804, Congress gave a territorial organization to that part of it which now constitutes the State of Louisiana. New Orleans, lying within that part, was an old and comparatively large city. There were other considerable towns and settlements, and slavery was extensively and thoroughly intermingled with the people. Congress did not, in the Territorial Act, prohibit slavery ; but they did interfere with it—take control of it—in a more marked and extensive way than they did in the case of Mississippi. The substance of the provision therein made, in relation to slaves, was :

FIRST. That no slave should be imported into the territory from foreign parts.

SECOND. That no slave should be carried into it who had been imported into the United States since the first day of May, 1798.

THIRD. That no slave should be carried into it, except by the owner, and for his own use as a settler; the penalty in all the cases being a fine upon the violator of the law, and freedom to the slave.

This act, also, was passed without yeas and nays. In the Congress which passed it, there were two of the "thirty-nine." They were Abraham Baldwin and Jonathan Dayton. As stated in the case of Mississippi, it is probable they both voted for it. They would not have allowed it to pass without recording their opposition to it, if, in their understanding, it violated either the line proper dividing local from federal authority or any provision of the Constitution.

In 1819—20, came and passed the Missouri question. Many votes were taken, by yeas and nays, in both branches of Congress, upon the various phases of the general question. Two of the "thirty-nine" Rufus King and Charles Pinckney—were members of that Congress. Mr. King steadily voted for slavery prohibition and against all compromises, while Mr. Pinckney as steadily voted against slavery prohibition and against all compromises. By this Mr. King showed that, in his understanding, no line, dividing local from federal authority, nor anything in the Consti-

tution, was violated by Congress prohibiting slavery in federal territory ; while Mr. Pinckney, by his votes, showed that in his understanding there was some sufficient reason for opposing such prohibition in that case.

The cases I have mentioned are the only acts of the "thirty-nine," or of any of them, upon the direct issue, which I have been able to discover.

To enumerate the persons who thus acted, as being four in 1784, three in 1787, seventeen in 1789, three in 1798, two in 1804, and two in 1819—20—there would be thirty-one of them. But this would be counting John Langdon, Roger Sherman, William Few, Rufus King, and George Read, each twice, and Abraham Baldwin four times. The true number of those of the "thirty-nine" whom I have shown to have acted upon the question, which, by the text they understood better than we, is twenty-three, leaving sixteen not shown to have acted upon it in any way.

Here, then, we have twenty-three out of our "thirty-nine" fathers who framed the Government under which we live, who have upon their official responsibility and their corporal oaths, acted upon the very question which the text affirms they "understood just as well, and even better than we do now ;" and twenty-one of them—a clear majority of the whole "thirty-nine"—so acting upon it as to make them guilty of gross political impropriety, and willful perjury, if, in their understanding, any proper division between local and federal

authority, or anything in the Constitution they had made themselves, and sworn to support, forbade the Federal Government to control as to slavery in the federal territories. Thus the twenty-one acted, and as actions speak louder than words, so actions under such responsibilities speak still louder.

Two of the twenty three voted against Congressional prohibition of slavery in the federal territories, in the instances in which they acted upon the question. But for what reasons they so voted is not known. They may have done so because they thought a proper division of local from federal authority or some provision or principle of the Constitution, stood in the way; or they may, without any such question, have voted against the prohibition, on what appeared to them to be sufficient grounds of expediency. No one who has sworn to support the Constitution, can conscientiously vote for what he understands to be an unconstitutional measure, however expedient he may think it; but one may and ought to vote against a measure which he deems constitutional, if, at the same time, he deems it inexpedient. It, therefore, would be unsafe to set down even the two who voted against the prohibition, as having done so because, in their understanding, any proper division of local from federal authority, or anything in the Constitution, forbade the Federal Government to control as to slavery in federal territory.

The remaining sixteen of the "thirty-

nine," so far as I have discovered, have left no record of their understanding upon the direct question of federal control of slavery in the federal territories. But there is much reason to believe that their understanding upon that question would not have appeared different from that of their twenty-three compeers, had it been manifested at all.

For the purpose of adhering rigidly to the text, I have purposely omitted whatever understanding may have been manifested, by any person, however distinguished, other than the thirty-nine fathers who framed the original Constitution ; and for the same reason, I have also omitted whatever understanding may have been manifested by any of the "thirty-nine" even, on any other phase of the general question of slavery. If we should look into their acts and declarations on those other phases, as the foreign slave-trade, and the morality and policy of slavery generally, it would appear to us that on the direct question of federal control of slavery in federal territories, the sixteen, if they had acted at all, would probably have acted just as the twenty-three did. Among that sixteen were several of the most noted anti-slavery men of those times—as Dr. Franklin, Alexander Hamilton and Gouverneur Morris—while there was not one now known to have been otherwise, unless it may be John Rutledge, of South Carolina.

The sum of the whole is, that of our "thirty-nine" fathers who framed the original Constitution, twenty-one—a clear

majority of the whole—certainly understood that no proper division of local from federal authority, nor any part of the Constitution, forbade the Federal Government to control slavery in the federal territories, while all the rest probably had the same understanding. Such, unquestionably, was the understanding of our fathers who framed the original Constitution ; and the text affirms that they understood the question better than we.

But, so far, I have been considering the understanding of the question manifested by the framers of the original Constitution. In and by the original instrument, a mode was provided for amending it ; and, as I have already stated, the present frame of Government under which we live consists of that original, and twelve amendatory articles framed and adopted since. Those who now insist that federal control of slavery in federal territories violates the Constitution, point us to the provisions which they suppose it thus violates ; and, as I understand, they all fix upon provisions in these amendatory articles, and not in the original instrument. The Supreme Court, in the Dred Scott case, plant themselves upon the fifth amendment, which provides that “ no person shall be deprived of property without due process of law ;” while Senator Douglas and his peculiar adherents plant themselves upon the tenth amendment, providing that the powers not granted by the Constitution, are reserved to the States respectively, and to the people.”

Now, it so happens that these amend-

ments were framed by the first Congress which sat under the Constitution—the identical Congress which passed the act already mentioned, enforcing the prohibition of slavery in the north-western territory. Not only was it the same Congress, but they were the identical, same individual men who, at the same session, and at the same time within the session, had under consideration, and in progress toward maturity, these Constitutional amendments, and this act prohibiting slavery in all the territory the nation then owned. The constitutional amendments were introduced before, and passed after the act enforcing the Ordinance of '87; so that during the whole pendency of the act to enforce the Ordinance, the Constitutional amendments were also pending.

That Congress, consisting in all of seventy-six members, including sixteen of the original Constitution, as before stated, were pre-eminently our fathers who framed that part of the Government under which we live, which is now claimed as forbidding the Federal Government to control slavery in the federal territories.

Is it not a little presumptuous in any one at this day to affirm that the two things which that Congress deliberately framed, and carried to maturity at the same time, are absolutely inconsistent with each other? And does not such affirmation become impudently absurd when coupled with the other affirmation, from the same mouth that those who did the two things alleged to be inconsistent

understood whether they really were inconsistent better than we—better than he who affirms that they are inconsistent?

It is surely safe to assume that the "thirty nine" framers of the original Constitution, and the seventy-six members of the Congress which framed the amendments thereto, taken together, do certainly include those who may be fairly called "our fathers who framed the Government under which we live." And so assuming, I defy any man to show that any one of them ever, in his whole life, declared that, in his understanding, any proper division of local from federal authority, or any part of the Constitution, forbade the Federal Government to control as to slavery in the federal territories. I go a step further. I defy any one to show that any living man in the whole world ever did, prior to the beginning of the present century (and I might almost say prior to the beginning of the last half of the present century), declare that, in his understanding, any proper division of local from federal authority, or any part of the Constitution, forbade the Federal Government to control as to slavery in the federal territories. To those who now so declare, I give, not only "our fathers who framed the Government under which we live," but with them all other living men within the century in which it was framed, among whom to search, and they shall not be able to find the evidence of a single man agreeing with them.

Now, and here, let me guard a little

against being misunderstood. I do not mean to say we are bound to follow implicitly in whatever our fathers did. To do so, would be to discard all the lights of current experience—to reject all progress—all improvement. What I do say is, that if we should supplant the opinions and policy of our fathers in any case, we should do so upon evidence so conclusive, and argument so clear, that even their great authority, fairly considered and weighed, cannot stand; and most surely not in a case whereof we ourselves declare they understood the question better than we.

If any man, at this day, sincerely believes that a proper division of local from federal authority, or any part of the Constitution, forbids the Federal Government to control as to slavery in the federal territories, he is right to say so, and to enforce his position by all truthful evidence and fair argument which he can. But he has no right to mislead others, who have less access to history and less leisure to study it, into the false belief that “our fathers, who framed the Government under which we live,” were of the same opinion—thus substituting falsehood and deception for truthful evidence and fair argument. If any man at this day sincerely believes “our fathers, who framed the Government under which we live,” used and applied principles, in other cases, which ought to have led them to understand that a proper division of local from federal authority, or some part of the Con-

stitution, forbids the Federal Government to control as to slavery in the federal territories, he is right to say so. But he should, at the same time, brave the responsibility of declaring that, in his opinion, he understands their principles better than they did themselves; and especially should he not shirk that responsibility by asserting that they "understood the question just as well, and even better, than we do now."

But enough. Let all who believe that "our fathers, who framed the Government under which we live, understood this question just as well, and even better than we do now," speak as they spoke, and act as they acted upon it. This is all Republicans ask—all Republicans desire—in relation to slavery. As those fathers marked it, so let it be again marked, as an evil not to be extended, but to be tolerated and protected only because of and so far as its actual presence among us makes that toleration and protection a necessity. Let all the guaranties those fathers gave it, be, not grudgingly, but fully and fairly, maintained. For this Republicans contend, and with this, so far as I know or believe, they will be content.

And now, if they would listen—as I suppose they will not—I would address a few words to the southern people.

I would say to them: You consider yourselves a reasonable and a just people; and I consider that in the general qualities of reason and justice you are not inferior to any other people. Still, when you

to speak of us Republicans, you do so only to denounce us as reptiles, or, at the best, as no better than outlaws. You will grant a hearing to pirates or murderers, but nothing like it to "Black Republicans." In all your contentions with one another, each of you deems an unconditional condemnation of "Black Republicanism" as the first thing to be attended to. Indeed, such condemnation of us seems to be an indispensable prerequisite—license, so to speak—among you to be admitted or permitted to speak at all.

Now, can you, or not, be prevailed upon to pause and to consider whether this is quite just to us, or even to yourselves?

Bring forward your charges and specifications, and then be patient long enough to hear us deny or justify.

You say we are sectional. We deny it. That makes an issue; and the burden of proof is upon you. You produce your proof; and what is it? Why, that our party has no existence in your section—gets no votes in your section. The fact is substantially true; but does it prove the issue? If it does, then in case we should, without change of principle, begin to get votes in your section, we should thereby cease to be sectional. You cannot escape this conclusion; and yet, are you willing to abide by it? If you are, you will probably soon find that we have ceased to be sectional, for we shall get votes in your section this very year. You will then begin to discover, as the truth plainly is, that your proof does not touch the issue.

The fact that we get no votes in your section is a fact of your making, and not of ours. And if there be fault in that fact, that fault is primarily yours, and remains so until you show that we repel you by some wrong principle or practice. If we do repel you by any wrong principle or practice, the fault is ours ; but this brings you to where you ought to have started—to a discussion of the right or wrong of our principle. If our principle, put in practice; would wrong your section for the benefit of ours, or for any other object, then our principle, and we with it, are sectional, and are justly opposed and denounced as such. Meet us, then, on the question of whether our principle, put in practice, would wrong your section ; and so meet it as if it were possible that something may be said on our side. Do you accept the challenge? No! Then you really believe that the principle which our fathers who framed the Government under which we live thought so clearly right as to adopt it, and indorse it again and again, upon their official oaths, is, in fact so clearly wrong as to demand your condemnation without a moment's consideration.

Some of you delight to flaunt in our faces the warning against sectional parties given by Washington in his Farewell Address. Less than eight years before Washington gave that warning, he had, as President of the United States approved and signed an act of Congress, enforcing the prohibition of slavery in the Northwestern Territory, which act embodied the policy

of the Government upon that subject, up to and at the very moment he penned that warning ; and about one year after he penned it he wrote Lafayette that he considered that prohibition a wise measure, expressing in the same connection his hope that we should some time have a confederacy of free States.

Bearing this in mind, and seeing that sectionalism has since arisen upon this same subject, is that warning a weapon in your hands against us, or in our hands against you? Could Washington himself speak, would he cast the blame of that sectionalism upon us, who sustain his policy, or upon you who repudiate it? We respect that warning of Washington, and we commend it to you, together with his example pointing to the right application of it.

But you say you are conservative—eminently conservative—while we are revolutionary, destructive, or something of the sort. What is conservatism? Is it not adherence to the old and tried, against the new and untried? We stick to, contend for, the identical old policy on the point in controversy which was adopted by our fathers who framed the Government under which we live ; while you with one accord reject, and scout, and spit upon that old policy, and insist upon substituting something new. True, you disagree among yourselves as to what that substitute shall be. You have considerable variety of new propositions and plans, but you are unanimous in rejecting and de-

nouncing the old policy of the fathers. Some of you are for reviving the foreign slave-trade ; some for a Congressional Slave-Code for the Territories ; some for a Congress forbidding the Territories to prohibit slavery within their limits ; some for maintaining Slavery in the Territories through the Judiciary ; some for the "gur-reat pur-rinciple" that "if one man would enslave another, no third man should object," fantastically called "Popular Sovereignty ;" but never a man among you in favor of federal prohibition of slavery in federal territories, according to the practice of our fathers who framed the Government under which we live. Not one of all your various plans can show a precedent or an advocate in the century within which our Government originated. Consider, then, whether your claim of conservatism for yourselves, and your charge of destructiveness against us, are based on the most clear and stable foundations.

Again, you say we have made the slavery question more prominent than it formerly was. We deny it. We admit that it is more prominent, but we deny that we made it so. It was not we, but you, who discarded the policy of the fathers. We resisted, and still resist, your innovation ; and thence comes the greater prominence of the question. Would you have that question reduced to its former proportions? Go back to that old policy. What has been will be again, under the same conditions. If you would

Have the peace of the old times, re-adopt the precepts and policy of the old times.

You charge that we stir up insurrections among your slaves. We deny it; and what is your proof? Harper's Ferry! John Brown!! John Brown was no Republican; and you have failed to implicate a single Republican in his Harper's Ferry enterprise. If any member of our party is guilty in that matter, you know it or you do not know it, you are inexcusable to not designate the man, and prove the fact. If you do not know it, you are inexcusable to assert it, and especially to persist in the assertion after you have tried and fail to make the proof. You need not be told that persisting in a charge which one does not know to be true, is simply malicious slander.

Some of you admit that no Republican designedly aided or encouraged the Harper's Ferry affair; but still insist that our doctrines and declarations necessarily lead to such results. We do not believe it. We know we hold to no doctrine, and make no declarations, which were not held to and made by our fathers who framed the Government under which we live. You never dealt fairly by us in relation to this affair. When it occurred, some important State elections were near at hand, and you were in evident glee with the belief that, by charging the blame upon us, you could get an advantage of us in those elections. The elections came, and your expectations were not quite fulfilled. Every Republican man knew that,

as to himself at least, your charge was a slander, and he was not much inclined by it to cast his vote in your favor. Republican doctrines and declarations are accompanied with a continual protest against any interference whatever with your slaves, or with you about your slaves. Surely this does not encourage them to revolt. True, we do, in common with our fathers, who framed the Government under which we live, declare our belief that slavery is wrong ; but the slaves do not hear us declare even this. For anything we say or do, the slaves would scarcely know there is a Republican party. I believe they would not, in fact, generally know it but for your misrepresentations of us, in their hearing. In your political contests among yourselves, each faction charges the other with sympathy with Black Republicanism ; and then, to give point to the charge, defines Black Republicanism to simply be insurrection, blood and thunder among slaves.

Slave insurrections are no more common now than they were before the Republican party was organized. What induced the Southampton insurrection, twenty-eight years ago, in which, at least, three times as many lives were lost as at Harper's Ferry ? You can scarcely stretch your very elastic fancy to the conclusion that Southampton was got up by Black Republicanism. In the present state of things in the United States, I do not think a general, or even a very extensive slave insurrection, is possible. The indispen-

sable concert of action cannot be attained. The slaves have no means of rapid communication ; nor can incendiary free men, black or white, supply it. The explosive materials are everywhere in parcels ; but there neither are, nor can be supplied, the indispensable connecting trains.

Much is said by Southern people about the affection of slaves for their masters and mistresses ; and a part of it, at least, is true. A plot for an uprising could scarcely be devised and communicated to twenty individuals before some one of them, to save the life of a favorite master or mistress, would divulge it. This is the rule ; and the slave-revolution in Hayti was not an exception to it, but a case occurring under peculiar circumstances. The gunpowder-plot of British history, though not connected with slaves, was more in point. In that case, only about twenty were admitted to the secret : and yet one of them, in his anxiety to save a friend, betrayed the plot to that friend, and, by consequence, averted the calamity. Occasional poisonings from the kitchen, and open or stealthy assassinations in the field, and local revolts extending to a score or so, will continue to occur as the natural results of slavery ; but no general insurrection of slaves, as I think, can happen in this country for a long time. Whoever much fears or much hopes, for such an event, will be alike disappointed.

In the language of Mr. Jefferson, uttered many years ago, " It is still in our power to direct the process of emancipation and

deportation peaceably, and in such slow degrees as that the evil will wear off insensibly ; and their places be, *pari passu*, filled up by free white laborers. If, on the contrary, it is left to force itself on, human nature must shudder at the prospect held up."

Mr Jefferson did not mean to say, nor do I, that the power of emancipation is in the Federal Government. He spoke of Virginia ; and as to the power of emancipation, I speak of the slaveholding States only.

The Federal Government, however, as we insist, has the power of restraining the extension of this institution—the power to insure that a slave insurrection shall never occur on any American soil which is now free from slavery.

John Brown's effort was peculiar. It was not a slave insurrection. It was an attempt by white men to get up a revolt among slaves. in which the slaves refused to participate. In fact, it was so absurd that the slaves, with all their ignorance, saw plainly enough that it could not succeed. That affair, in its philosophy, corresponds with the many attempts related in history, at the assassination of kings and emperors. An enthusiast broods over the oppression of a people till he fancies himself commissioned by Heaven to liberate them. He ventures the attempt, which ends in little else than his own execution. Orsini's attempt on Louis Napoleon, and John Brown's attempt at Harper's Ferry, were, in their philosophy,

precisely the same. The eagerness to cast blame on old England in the one case, and on New England in the other, does not disprove the sameness of the two things.

And how much would it avail you, if you could, by the use of John Brown, Helper's book, and the like, break up the Republican organization? Human action can be modified to some extent, but human nature cannot be changed. There is a judgment and a feeling against slavery in this nation, which cast at least a million and a half of votes. You cannot destroy that judgment and feeling—that sentiment—by breaking up the political organization which rallies around it. You can scarcely scatter and disperse an army which has been formed into order in the face of your heaviest fire, but if you could, how much would you gain by forcing the sentiment which created it out of the peaceful channel of the ballot box, into some other channel? What would that other channel probably be? Would the number of John Browns be lessened or enlarged by the operation?

But you will break up the Union rather than submit to a denial of your Constitutional rights.

That has a somewhat reckless sound; but it would be palliated if not fully justified, were we proposing, by the mere force of numbers, to deprive you of some right, plainly written down in the Constitution. But we are proposing no such thing.

When you make these declarations, you

have a specific and well-understood allusion to an assumed Constitutional right of yours, to take slaves into the federal territories, and to hold them there as property. But no such right is specifically written in the Constitution. That instrument is literally silent about any such right. We, on the contrary, deny that such a right has any existence in the Constitution, even by implication.

Your purpose, then, plainly stated, is, that you will destroy the Government, unless you be allowed to construe and enforce the Constitution as you please, on all points in dispute between you and us. You will rule or ruin in all events.

This, plainly stated, is your language to us. Perhaps you will say the Supreme Court has decided the disputed Constitutional question in your favor. Not quite so. But waiving the lawyer's distinction between dictum and decision, the Courts have decided the question for you in a sort of way. The Courts have substantially said, it is your Constitutional right to take slaves into the federal territories, and to hold them there as property.

When I say the decision was made in a sort of way, I mean it was made in a divided Court by a bare majority of the Judges, and they not quite agreeing with one another in the reasons for making it ; that it is so made as that its avowed supporters disagree with one another about its meaning ; and that it was mainly based upon a mistaken statement of fact, the statement in the opinion that " the right of

property in a slave is distinctly and expressly affirmed in the Constitution.”

An inspection of the Constitution will show that the right of property in a slave is not distinctly and expressly affirmed in it. Bear in mind that the Judges do not pledge their judicial opinion that such right is impliedly affirmed in the Constitution ; but they pledge their veracity that it is distinctly and expressly affirmed there—“distinctly” that is, not mingled with anything else—“expressly” that is, in words meaning just that, without the aid of any inference, and susceptible of no other meaning.

If they had only pledged their judicial opinion that such right is affirmed in the instrument by implication, it would be open to others to show that neither the “slave” nor “Slavery” is to be found in the Constitution, nor the word “property” even, in any connection with language alluding to the things slave, or slavery, and that wherever in that instrument the slave is alluded to, he is called a “person ;” and wherever his master’s legal right in relation to, it is spoken of as “service or labor due,” as a “debt” payable in service or labor. Also, it would be open to show, by contemporaneous history, that this mode of alluding to slaves and slavery, instead of speaking of them, was employed on purpose to exclude from the Constitution the idea that there could be property in man.

To show all this is easy and certain.

When this obvious mistake of the Judges

shall be brought to their notice, is it not reasonable to expect that they will withdraw the mistaken statement, and reconsider the conclusion based upon it?

And then it is to be remembered that "our fathers, who framed the Government under which we live"—the men who made the Constitution—decided this same Constitutional question in our favor, long ago—decided it without a division among themselves, when making the decision; without division among themselves about the meaning of it after it was made, and so far as any evidence is left, without basing it upon any mistaken statement of facts.

Under all these circumstances, do you really feel yourselves justified to break up this Government, unless such a court decision as yours is shall be at once submitted to as a conclusive and final rule of political action?

But you will not abide the election of a Republican President. In that supposed event, you say, you will destroy the Union; and then, you say, the great crime of having destroyed it will be upon us!

That is cool. A highwayman holds a pistol to my ear, and mutters through his teeth, "stand and deliver, or I shall kill you, and then you will be a murderer!"

To be sure, what the robber demanded of me—my money—was my own; and I had a clear right to keep it; but it was no more my own than my vote is my own: and the threat of death to me, to extort my money, and the threat of destruction

to the Union, to extort my vote, can scarcely be distinguished in principle.

A few words now to Republicans. It is exceedingly desirable that all parts of this great Confederacy shall be at peace, and in harmony, one with another. Let us Republicans do our part to have it so. Even though much provoked, let us do nothing through passion and ill temper. Even though the southern people will not so much as listen to us, let us calmly consider their demands, and yield to them if, in our deliberate view of our duty, we possibly can. Judging by all they say and do, and by the subject and nature of their controversy with us, let us determine, if we can, what will satisfy them?

Will they be satisfied if the Territories be unconditionally surrendered to them? We know they will not. In all their present complaints against us, the Territories are scarcely mentioned. Invasions and insurrections are the rage now. Will it satisfy them if, in the future, we have nothing to do with invasions and insurrections? We know it will not. We know it will not. We so know because we know we never had anything to do with invasions and insurrections; and yet this total abstaining does not exempt us from the charge and the denunciation.

The question recurs, what will satisfy them? Simply this: We must not only let them alone, but we must, somehow, convince them that we do let them alone. This, we know by experience, is no easy task. We have been so trying to convince

them, from the very beginning of our organization, but with no success. In all our platforms and speeches we have constantly protested our purpose to let them alone; but this has had no tendency to convince them. Alike unavailing to convince them is the fact that they have never detected a man of us in any attempt to disturb them.

These natural, and apparently adequate means all failing, what will convince them? This, and this only: cease to call slavery wrong, and join them in calling it right. And this must be done thoroughly—done in acts as well as in words. Silence will not be tolerated—we must place ourselves avowedly with them. Douglas's new sedition law must be enacted and enforced, suppressing all declarations that slavery is wrong, whether made in politics, in presses, in pulpits, or in private. We must arrest and return their fugitive slaves with greedy pleasure. We must pull down our Free-State constitutions. The whole atmosphere must be disinfected from all taint of opposition to slavery, before they will cease to believe that all their troubles proceed from us.

I am quite aware they do not state their case precisely in this way. Most of them would probably say to us, "Let us alone, do nothing to us, and say what you please about slavery." But we do let them alone—have never disturbed them—so that, after all, it is what we say, which dissatisfies them. They will continue to accuse us of doing, until we cease saying.

I am also aware they have not, as yet,

in terms, demanded the overthrow of our Free-State Constitutions. Yet those Constitutions declare the wrong of slavery, with more solemn emphasis, than do all other sayings against it; and when all these other sayings shall have been silenced, the overthrow of these Constitutions will be demanded, and nothing be left to resist the demand. It is nothing to the contrary, that they do not demand the whole of this just now. Demanding what they do, and for the reason they do, they can voluntarily stop nowhere short of this consummation. Holding, as they do, that slavery is morally right, and socially elevating, they cannot cease to demand a full national recognition of it, as a legal right and a social blessing.

Nor can we justifiably withhold this, on any ground, save our conviction that slavery is wrong. If slavery is right, all words, acts, laws, and constitutions against it, are themselves wrong, and should be silenced and swept away. If it is right, we cannot justly object to its nationality—its universality; if it is wrong, they cannot justly insist upon its extension—its enlargement. All they ask, we could readily grant, if we thought slavery right; all we ask, they could as readily grant, if they thought it wrong. Their thinking it right, and our thinking it wrong, is the precise fact upon which depends the whole controversy. Thinking it right, as they do, they are not to blame for desiring its full recognition, as being right; but, thinking it wrong, as we do, can we yield to them? Can we cast

our votes with their view, and against our own? In view of our moral, social, and political responsibilities, can we do this?

Wrong as we think slavery is, we can yet afford to let it alone where it is, because that much is due to the necessity arising from its actual presence in the nation; but can we, while our votes will prevent it, allow it to spread into the National Territories, and to overrun us here in those Free States?

If our sense of duty forbids this, then let us stand by our duty, fearlessly and effectively. Let us be diverted by none of those sophistical contrivances wherewith we are so industriously plied and belabored—contrivances such as groping for some middle ground between the right and the wrong, vain as the search for a man who should be neither a living man nor a dead man—such as a policy of “don’t care” on a question about which all true men do care—such as Union appeals, beseeching true Union men to yield to Disunionists, reversing the divine rule, and calling, not the sinners, but the righteous to repentance—such as invocations to Washington, imploring men to unsay what Washington said, and undo what Washington did.

Neither let us be slandered from our duty by false accusations against us, nor frightened from it by menace of destruction to the Government, nor of dungeons to ourselves. Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us, to the end, dare to do our duty, as we understand it.

EDITOR'S NOTE: This page is blank in the original edition but the above notice is inserted that this reprint may not be confused with the first edition if the cover is destroyed.

LOUIS A. WARREN

Fort Wayne, Ind.

January 1, 1938

SPEECH OF THE HON AB. LINCOLN.

IN REPLY TO SENATOR DOUGLAS.

*Delivered at Chicago, Saturday evening
July 10, 1858. (Mr. Douglas was not
present.)*

Mr. Lincoln was introduced by C. L. Wilson Esqr., and as he made his appearance he was greeted with a perfect storm of applause. For some moments the enthusiasm continued unabated. At last, when by a wave of his hand partial silence was restored; Mr Lincoln said:

MR FELLOW CITIZENS: On yesterday evening, upon the occasion of the reception given to Senator Douglas, I was furnished with a seat very convenient for hearing him, and was otherwise very courteously treated by him and his friends, and for which I thank him and them. During the course of his remarks my name was mentioned in such a way as, I suppose renders it at least not improper that I should make some sort of reply to him. I shall not attempt to follow him in the precise order in which he addressed the assembled multitude upon that occasion, though I shall perhaps do so in the main.

There was one question to which he asked the attention of the crowd, which I deem of somewhat less importance—at least of propriety for me to dwell upon—than the others, which he brought in near the close of his speech, and which I think it would not be entirely proper for me to

omit attending to, and yet if I were not to give some attention to it now, I should probably forget it altogether. While I am upon this subject, allow me to say that I do not intend to indulge in that inconvenient mode sometimes adopted in public speaking, of reading from documents; but I shall depart from that rule so far as to read a little scrap from his speech, which notices this first topic of which I shall speak—that is provided I can find it in the paper.

“I have made up my mind to appeal to the people against the combination that has been made against me! the Republican leaders having formed an alliance, an unholy and unnatural alliance, with a portion of unscrupulous office-holders, I intend to fight that allied army wherever I meet them. I know they deny the alliance, but yet these men who are trying to divide the Democratic party for the purpose of electing a Republican Senator in my place, are just the agents and tools of the supporters of Mr. Lincoln. Hence I shall deal with this allied army just as the Russians dealt with the allies at Sebastopol—that is, the Russians did not stop to inquire, when they fired a broadside, whether it hit an Englishman, a Frenchman, or a Turk. Nor will I stop to inquire nor shall I hesitate, whether my blows shall hit these Republican leaders or their allies, who are holding the federal offices and yet acting in concert with them.”

Well, now, gentlemen, is not that very

alarming? Just to think of it? right at the outset of his canvass, I, a poor, kind, amiable, intelligent gentleman, am to be slain in that way. Why, my friend, the Judge is not only, as it turns out, not a dead lion, nor even a living one he is a rugged Russian Bear!

But if they will have it—for he says that we deny it—that there is any such alliance, as he says there is—and I don't propose hanging very much upon this question of veracity—but if he will have it that, here is such alliance—that the Administration men and we are allied, and we stand in the attitude of English French and Turk, he occupying the position of the Russian, in that case I beg that he will indulge us while we barely suggest to him that these allies took Sebastopol.

Gentlemen, only a few more words as to this alliance. For my part, I have to say, that whether there be such alliance, depends, so far as I know, upon what may be a right definition of the term *alliance*. If for the Republican party to see the other great party to which they are opposed divided among themselves, and not try to stop the division and rather be glad of it—if that is an alliance, I confess I am in; but if it is meant to be said that the Republicans had formed an alliance going beyond that, by which there is contribution of money or sacrifice of principle on the one side or the other, so far as the Republican party is concerned, if there be any such thing, I protest that I neither know anything of it, nor do I believe it.

I will, however, say—as I think this branch of the argument lugged in—I would before I leave it, state, for the benefit of those concerned, that one of those same Buchanan men once told me of an argument that he made for his opposition to Judge Douglas. He said that a friend of our Senator Douglas had been talking to him, and had among other things, said to him: “Why, you do n’t want to beat Douglas?” “Yes,” said he, “I do want to beat him, and I will tell you why. I believe his original Nebraska bill was right in the abstract, but it was wrong in the time that it was brought forward. It was wrong in the application to a Territory in regard to which the question had been settled; it was brought forward at a time when nobody asked him; it was tendered to the South when the South had not asked for it, but when they could not well refuse it; and for this same reason he forced that question upon our party; it has sunk the best men all over the nation, everywhere; and now when our President, struggling with the difficulty of this man’s getting up, has reached the very hardest point to turn in the case, he deserts him, and I am for putting him where he will trouble us no more.”

Now, gentlemen, that is not my argument—that is not my argument at all. I have only been stating to you the argument of a Buchanan man. You will judge if there is any force in it.

Popular sovereignty! everlasting popular sovereignty! Let us for a moment in-

quire into this vast matter of popular sovereignty. What is popular sovereignty? We recollect that at an early period in the history of this struggle, there was another name for the same thing—*Squatter Sovereignty*. It was not exactly Popular Sovereignty, but Squatter Sovereignty. What do those terms mean? What do those terms mean when used now? And vast credit is taken by our friend, the Judge, in regard to his support of it, when he declares the last years of his life have been, and all the future years of his life have been, and all the future years of his life shall be devoted to this matter of popular sovereignty. What is it? Why, it is the sovereignty of the people! What was Squatter Sovereignty? I suppose if it had any significance at all it was the right of the people to govern themselves, to be sovereign in their own affairs while they were squatted down in a country not their own, while they had squatted on a Territory that did not belong to them, in the sense that a State belongs to the people who inhabit it—when it belonged to the nation—such right to govern themselves was called “Squatter Sovereignty.”

Now I wish you to mark. What has become of that Squatter Sovereignty? What has become of it? Can you get anybody to tell you now that the people of a Territory have any authority to govern themselves, in regard to this mooted question of slavery, before they form a State, Constitution? No such thing at all, although there is a general running fire, and

although there has been a hurra made in every speech on that side, assuming that policy had given the people of a Territory the right to govern themselves upon this question; yet the point is dodged. To-day it has been decided—no more than a year ago it was decided by the Supreme Court of the United States, and is insisted upon to-day, that the people of a Territory have no right to exclude slavery from a Territory, that if any one man chooses to take slaves into a Territory, all the rest of the people have no right to keep them out. This being so, and the decision being made one of the points that the Judge approved, and one in the approval of which he says he means to keep me down—put me down I should not say, for I have never been up. He says he is in favor of it, and sticks to it, and expects to win his battle on that decision, which says that there is no such thing as Squatter Sovereignty; but that any one man may take slaves into a Territory, and all the other men in the Territory may be opposed to it, and yet by reason of the Constitution they cannot prohibit it. When that is so, how much is left of this vast matter of Squatter Sovereignty I should like to know?

When we get back, we get to the point of the right of the people to make a Constitution. Kansas was settled, for example, in 1854. It was a Territory yet, without having formed a Constitution, in a very regular way, for three years. All this time negro slavery could be taken in by any few individuals, and by that de-

cision of the Supreme Court, which the Judge approves, all the rest of the people cannot keep it out; but when they come to make a Constitution they may say they will not have slavery. But it is there, they are obliged to tolerate it some way; and all experience shows it will be so—for they will not take the negro slaves and absolutely deprive the owners of them. All experience shows this to be so. All that space of time that runs from the beginning of the settlement of the Territory until there is a sufficiency of people to make a State Constitution—all that portion of time popular sovereignty is given up. The seal is absolutely put down upon it by the Court decision; and Judge Douglas puts his own upon the top of that, yet he is appealing to the people to give him vast credit for his devotion to popular sovereignty.

Again, when we get to the question of the right of the people to form a State Constitution as they please, to form it with or without slavery—if that is any thing new, I confess I don't know it. Has there ever been a time when any body said that any other than the people of a Territory itself should form Constitution? What is now in it that Judge Douglas should have fought several years of his life, and pledge himself to fight all the remaining years of his life for? Can Judge Douglas find any body on earth that said that any body else should form a Constitution for a people? [A voice, "Yes."] Well, I should like you to name him; I should like to know who

he was. [Same voice, "John Calhoun."]

Mr. Lincoln—No, Sir, I never heard of even John Calhoun saying such a thing. He insisted on the same principle as Judge Douglas; but his mode of applying it, in fact, was wrong. It is enough for my purpose to ask this crowd, when ever a Republican said anything against it? They never said anything against it, but they have constantly spoken for it; and whosoever will undertake to examine the platform, and the speeches of responsible men of the party, and of irresponsible men, too, if you please, will be unable to find one word from anybody in the Republican ranks, opposed to that Popular Sovereignty which Judge Douglas thinks that he has invented. I suppose that Judge Douglas will claim in a little while, that he is the inventor of the idea that the people should govern themselves; that nobody ever thought of such a thing until he brought it forward. We do not remember, that in that old Declaration of Independence, it is said that "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." There is the origin of Popular Sovereignty. Who, then, shall come in at this day and claim that he invented it?

The Lecompton Constitution connects

itself with this question, for it is in this matter of the Lecompton Constitution that our friend Judge Douglas claims such vaste credit. I agree that in opposng the Lecompton Constitution, so far as I can perceive, he was right. I do not deny that at all; and, gentlemen, you will readily see why I could not deny it, even if I wanted to. But I do not wish to; for all the Republicans in the nation opposed it, and they would have opposed it just as much without Judge Douglas's aid as with it. They had all taken ground against it long before he did. Why, the reason that he urges against the Constitution I urged against him a year before. I have the printed speech in my hand. The argument that he makes, why that Constitution should not be adopted, that the people were not fairly represented nor allowed to vote, I pointed out in a speech a year ago, which I hold in my hand now. That no fair chance to be was given to the people. ["Read it," "read it"] I shall not waste your time by trying to read it. ["Read it," read it."] Gentlemen, reading from speeches is a very tedious business, particularly for an old man that has to put on spectacles, and more so if the man be so tall that he has to bend over to the light.

A little more, now, as to this matter of Popular Sovereignty and the Lecompton Constitution. The Lecompton Constitution, as the Judge tells us, was defeated. The defeat of it was a good thing or it was not. He thinks the defeat of it was a

good thing, and so do I, and we agree in that. Who defeated it?

A voice—"Judge Douglas."

Mr. Lincoln—Yes, he furnished himself, and if you suppose he controlled the other Democrats that went with him, he furnished *three* votes, while the Republicans furnished *twenty*.

That is what he did to defeat it. In the House of Representative and his friends furnished some twenty votes, and the Republicans furnished *ninety odd*.

Now, who was it that did the work?

A voice—"Douglas."

Mr. Lincoln—Why, yes, Douglas did it! To be sure he did.

Let us, however, put that proposition another way. The Republicans could not have done it without Judge Douglas. Could he have done it without them? Which could have come the nearest to doing it without the other?

A voice—"Who killed the bill?"

Another voice—"Douglas."

Mr. Lincoln—Ground was taken against it by the Republicans long before Douglas did it. The proportion of opposition to that measure is about five to one.

A voice—"Why don't they come out on it?"

Mr. Lincoln—You don't know what you are talking about, my friend. I am quite willing to answer any gentleman in the crowd who asks an *intelligent* question.

Now who, in all this country, has ever found any of our friends of Judge Douglas's way of thinking, and who have acted

upon this main question, that has ever thought of uttering a word in behalf of Judge Trumbull?

A voice—"We have."

Mr. Lincoln—I defy you to show a printed resolution passed in a Democratic meeting—I take it upon myself to defy any man to show a printed resolution of a Democratic meeting, large or small, in favor of Judge Trumbull, or any of the five to one Republicans who beat that bill. Every thing must be for the Democrats! They did every thing, and the five to the one that really did the thing, they snub over, and they do not seem to remember that they have an existence upon the face of the earth.

Gentlemen, I fear that I shall become tedious. I leave this branch of the subject to take hold of another. I take up that part of Judge Douglas's speech in which he respectfully attended to me.

Judge Douglas made two points upon my recent speech at Springfield. He says they are to be the issues of the campaign. The first one of these points he bases upon the language in a speech which I delivered at Springfield, which I believe I can quote correctly from memory. I said there that "we are now far into the fifth year since a policy was instituted for the avowed object, and with the confident promise, of putting an end to slavery agitation; under the operation of that policy, that agitation had only not ceased, but had constantly augmented." "I believe it will not cease until a crisis shall have

been reached and passed. 'A house divided against itself cannot stand.' I believe this Government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free." "I do not expect the Union to be dissolved"—I am quoting from my speech—"I do not expect the house to fall, but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing or the other. Either the opponents of slavery will arrest the spread of it and place it where the public mind shall rest, in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction, or its advocates will push it forward until it shall become alike lawful in all the States, North as well as South."

What is the paragraph? In this paragraph which I have quoted in your hearing, and to which I ask the attention of all, Judge Douglas thinks he discovers great political heresy. I want your attention particularly to what he has inferred from it. He says I am in favor of making all the States of this Union uniform in all their internal regulations; that in all their domestic concerns I am in favor of making them entirely uniform. He draws this inference from the language I have quoted to you. He says that I am in favor of making war by the North upon the South for the extinction of Slavery; that I am also in favor of inviting (as he expressed it) the South to war upon the North, for the purpose of nationalizing slavery. Now, it is singular enough, if you will carefully read that passage over, that I did not say that, I was in favor of

anything in it. I only said what I expected would take place. I made a prediction only—it may have been a foolish one perhaps. I did not even say that I desired that slavery should be put in course of ultimate extinction. I do say so now, however, so there need be no longer any difficulty about that. It may be written down in the great speech.

Gentlemen, Judge Douglas informed you that this speech of mine was probably carefully prepared. I admit that it was. I am not master of language; I have not a fine education; I am not capable of entering into a disquisition upon dialects, as I believe you call it; but I do not believe the language I employed bears any such construction as Judge Douglas puts upon it. But I don't care about a quibble in regard to words. I know what I meant, and I will not leave this crowd in doubt, if I can explain to them what I really meant in the use of that paragraph.

I am not, in the first place, unaware that this Government has endured eighty-two years, half slave and half free. I know that. I am tolerably well acquainted with the history of the country, and I know that it has endured eighty-two years half slave and half free. I *believe*—and that is what I meant to allude to there—I *believe* it has endured, because during all that time, until the introduction of the Nebraska bill, the public mind did rest all the time in the belief that slavery was in course of ultimate extinction. That was what gave us the rest that we had through

that period of eighty-two years; at least, so I believe. I have always hated slavery, I think as much as any Abolitionist—I have been an Old Line Whig—I have always hated it, but I have always been quiet about it until this new era of the introduction of the Nebraska bill began. I always believed that everybody was against it, and that it was in course of ultimate extinction. [Pointing to Mr. Browning, who stood near by.] Browning thought so; the great mass of the nation have rested in the belief that slavery was in course of ultimate extinction. They had reason so to believe.

The adoption of the Constitution and its attendant history led the people to believe so; and that such was the belief of the framers of the Constitution itself, why did those old men, about the time of the adoption of the Constitution, decree that slavery should not go into the new Territory, where it had not already gone? Why declare that within twenty years the African Slave Trade, by which slaves are supplied, might be cut off by Congress? Why were all these acts? I might enumerate more of these acts—but enough. What were they but a clear indication that the framers of the Constitution intended and expected the ultimate extinction of that institution? And now, when I say, as I said in my speech, that Judge Douglas has quoted from, when I say I think the opponents of slavery will resist the farther spread of it, and place it where the public mind shall rest with the belief that it is in

course of ultimate extinction, I only mean to say, that they will place it where the founders of this Government originally placed it.

I have said a hundred times, and I have now no inclination to take it back, that I believe there is no right, and ought to be no inclination in the people of the free States to enter into the slave States, and interfere with the question of slavery at all. I have said that always; Judge Douglas has heard me say it—if not quite a hundred times, at least as good as a hundred times; and when it is said that I am in favor of interfering with slavery where it exists, I know it is unwarranted by anything I have ever "intended," and, as I believe, by anything I have ever said. If, by any means, I have ever used language which could fairly be so construed, (as, however, I believe I never have,) I now correct it,

So much, then, for the inference that Judge Douglas draws, that I am in favor of setting the sections at war with one another. I know that I never meant any such thing, and I believe that no fair mind can infer any such thing from what I have ever said.

Now in relation to his inference, that I am in favor of a general consolidation of all the local institutions of all the various States, I will attend to that for a little while, and try to inquire, if I can, how on earth it could be that any man could draw such an inference from anything I said, I have said, very many times, in Judge

Douglas's hearing, that no man believed more than I in the principle of self-government; that lies at the bottom of all my ideas of just government, from beginning to end. I have denied that his use of that term applies properly. But for the thing itself I deny that any man has ever gone ahead of me in his devotion to the principle, whatever he may have done in efficiency in advocating it. I think that I have said it in your hearing—that I believe each individual is naturally entitled to do as he pleases with himself and the fruit of his labor, so far as it nowise interferes with any other man's rights—that each community, as a state, has a right to do exactly as it pleases with all the concerns within that State that interferes with the right of no other State, and that the General Government, upon principle, has no right to interfere with any other than that general class of things that does concern the whole. I have said that at all times. I have said as illustrations, that I do not believe in the right of Illinois to interfere with this cranberry laws of Indiana, the oyster laws of Virginia, or the liquor laws of Maine. I have said these things over and over again, and I repeat them here as my sentiments.

How is it, then, that Judge Douglas infers, because I hope to see slavery put where the public mind shall rest on the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction, that I am in favor of Illinois going over and interfering with the cranberry laws of Indiana? What can authorize him

to draw any such inference? I suppose there might be one thing that at least enabled *him* to draw such an inference that would not be true with me or many others, that is, because he looks upon all this matters of slavery as an exceedingly little thing—this matter of keeping one sixth of the population of the whole nation in a state of oppression and tyranny unequaled in the world. He looks upon it as being an exceedingly little thing—only equal to the question of the cranberry laws of Indiana—as something having no moral question in it—as something on a par with the question of whether a man shall pasture his land with cattle, or plant it with tobacco.— so little and so small a thing, that he concludes, if I could desire that if anything should be done to bring about the ultimate extinction of that little thing, I must be in favor of bringing about an amalgamation of all the other little things in the Union. Now it so happens—and there I presume, is the foundation of this mistake—that the Judge thinks thus; and it so happens that there is a vast portion of the American people that do *not* look upon the matter as being this very little thing. They look upon it as a vast moral evil; they can prove it as such by the writings of those who gave us the blessing of liberty which we enjoy, and that they so looked upon it, and not as an evil merely confining itself to the States where it is situated; and while we agree that, by the Constitution we assented to, in the States where it exists we have no right to inter-

here with it, because it is in the Constitution; and we are both by duty and inclination to stick to that Constitution, in all its letter and spirit, from beginning to end.

So much then as to my disposition—my wish—to have all the State Legislatures blotted out, and to have one consolidated government, and a uniformity of domestic regulations in all the States, by which I suppose it meant, if we raise corn here, we must make sugar cane grow here too, and we must make those which grow in the North grow in the South. All this I suppose he understands I am in favor of doing. Now, so much for all this nonsense for I must call it so. The Judge can have no issue with me on a question of establishing uniformity in the domestic regulations of the States.

A little now on the other point—the Dred Scott decision. Another of the issues he says that is to be made with me, is upon his devotion to the Dred Scott decision, and my opposition to it.

I have expressed heretofore, and I now repeat, my opposition to the Dred Scott decision, but I should be allowed to state the nature of that opposition, and I ask your indulgence while I do so. What is fairly implied by the term Judge Douglas has used, “resistance to the decision?” I do not resist it. If I wanted to take Dred Scott from his master, I would be interfering with property, and that terrible difficulty that Judge Douglas speaks of, of interfering with property would arise.

But I am doing no such thing as that, but all that I am doing is refusing to obey it as a political rule. If I were in Congress, and a vote should come up on the question whether slavery should be prohibited in a new Territory, in spite of the Dred Scott decision I would vote that it should.

Mr. Lincoln—that is what I would do. Judge Douglas said last night, that before the decision he might advance his opinion, and it might be contrary to the decision when it was made; but after it was made he would abide by it until it was reversed. Just so! We let this property abide by the decision, but we will try to reverse that decision. We will try to put it where Judge Douglas would not object, for he says he will obey it until it is reversed. Somebody has to reverse that decision, since it is made, and we mean to reverse it, and we mean to do it peacefully.

What are the uses of decisions in courts? They have two uses. As rules of property they have two uses. First—they decide upon the question before the court. They decide in this case that Dred Scott is a slave. Nobody resists that. Not only that, but they say to everybody else, that persons standing just as Dred Scott stands is as he is. That is, they say when a question comes up on another person it will be so decided again unless the court decided in another way unless the court overrules its decision. Well, we mean to do what we can to have the court decide the other way. That is one thing we mean to try to do.

The sacredness that Judge Douglas throws around this decision, is a degree of sacredness that has never been before throw around any other decision. I have never heard of such a thing. Why decisions apparently contrary to that decision, or that good lawyers thought were contrary to that decision, have been made by that very court before. It is the first of its kind; it is an astonisher in legal history. It is a new wonder of the world. It is based upon falsehood as to the facts—allegations of facts upon which it stands are not facts at all in many instances, and no decision made on any question—the first instance of a decision made under so many unfavorable circumstance—thus placed, has ever been held by the profession as law, but has always needed confirmation before the lawyers regarded it as settled law. But Judge Douglas will have it that all hands must take this extraordinary decision, made under these extraordinary circumstances, and give their vote in Congress in accordance with it, yield to it and obey it in every possible sense. Circumstances alter cases. Do not gentlemen here remember the case of that same Supreme Court, some twenty-five or thirty years ago, deciding that a National Bank was constitutional? I ask, if somebody here does not remember that a National Bank was declared to be constitutional? Such is the truth, whether it be remembered or not. The Bank charter ran out, and a re charter was granted by Congress. That re-charter was laid before

General Jackson. It was urged upon him when he denied the constitutionality of the Bank, that the Supreme Court had decided that it was constitutional; and that General Jackson then said that the Supreme Court had no right to lay down a rule to govern a co-ordinate branch of the Government, the members of which had sworn to support the Constitution—that each member had sworn to support that Constitution as he understood it. I will venture here to say, that I have heard Judge Douglas say that he approved of General Jackson for that act. What has now become of all his tirade about “resistance to the Supreme Court?”

SPEECH OF HON. ABM. LINCOLN,

At Springfield, June 1853.

[The following speech was delivered at Springfield, Ill., at the close of the Republican State Convention held at that time and place, and by which Convention Mr. Lincoln had been named as their candidate for U. S. Senator. Mr. Douglas was not present.]

MR. PRESIDENT, AND GENTLEMEN OF THE CONVENTION: If we could first know where we are, and whether we are tending, we could better judge what to do, and how to do it. We are now far into the fifth year since a policy was initiated with the avowed object and confident promise, of putting an end to Slavery agitation. Under the operation of that policy, that agitation has not only not ceased, but has constantly augmented. In my opinion, it will not cease, until a crisis shall have been reached and past. "A house divided against itself cannot stand." I believe this government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved—I do not expect the house to fall—but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing, or all the other. Either the opponents will arrest the further spread of it, and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction; or its advocates will push it forward, till it shall become alike

lawful in all the States, old as well as new—North as well as South.

Have we no tendency to the latter condition?

Let any one who doubts, carefully contemplate that now almost complete legal combination—piece of machinery so to speak—compounded of the Nebraska doctrine of the Dred Scott decision. Let him consider not only what work the machinery is adapted to do, and how well adapted; but also let him study the history of its construction, and trace, if he can, or rather fail if he can, to trace the evidences of design and concert of action, among its chief architects, from the beginning.

The new year of 1854 found slavery excluded from more than half the States by Congressional prohibition. Four days later, commenced the struggle which ended in repealing that Congressional prohibition. This opened all the national territory to slavery, and was the first point gained,

This necessity had not been overlooked; but had been provided for, as well as might be, in the notable argument of “quarter sovereignty,” “sacred right of self-government,” which latter phrase, though expressive of the only rightful basis of any government, was so perverted in this attempted use of it as to amount to just this: That if any *one* man choose to to enslave *another*, no *third* man shall be allowed to object. That argument was incorporated into the Nebraska bill itself, in the language which follows: “It being

the true intent and meaning of this act not to legislate slavery into any Territory or State, nor to exclude it therefrom; but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject to the Constitution of the United States. Then opened the roar of loose declamation in favour of the Squatter Sovereignty, and and "sacred right of self-government." "But" said opposition members, "let us amend the bill so as to expressly declare that the people of the Territory may exclude slavery." Not we, said the friends of the measure; and down they voted the amendment.

While the Nebraska bill was passing through Congress, a *law case* involving the question of a negro's freedom, by reason of his owner having voluntarily taken him first into a free State and their Territory covered by the Congressiana prohibition, and held him as a slave for a long time in each, was passing through the U. S. Circuit Court for the District of Missouri; and both Nebraska bill and law suit were brought to a decision in the same month of May, 1854. The negro's was "Dred Sco't," which name now designates the decision finally made in the case. Before the then next Presidential election, the law case came to, and was argued in, the Supreme Court of the United States; but the decision of it was deferred until after the election. Still before the election, Senator Trumbull, on the floor of the Senate, requesting the leading advo-

cato of the Nebraska bill to state *his opinion* whether the people of a Territory can constitutionally exclude slavery from from their limits ; and the latter answers ; " That is a question for the Supreme Court."

The election came, Mr. Buchanan was elected, and the endorsement, such as it was, secured. That was the point gained. The endorsement, however, fell short of a clear popular majority by nearly four hundred thousand votes, and so perhaps was not overwhelmingly reliable and satisfactory. The outgoing President, in his last annual message, as impressively as as possibly echoed back upon the people the weight and authority of the endorsement. The Supreme Court met again ; did not announce their decision, but ordered a re- argument. The Presidential inaugural address, fervently exhorted the people to abide by the forthcoming decision, whatever it might be. Then in a few days came the decision.

The reputed author of the Nebraska bill finds an early occasion to make a speech at this capital indorsing the Dred Scott decision, and vehemently denouncing all opposition to it. The new President, the seizes the early occasion of the Silliman letter to endorse and strongly construe that decision' and to express his astonishment that any different view had ever been entertained !

At length a squabble springs up between the President and the author of the Nebraska bill, on the mere question of *fact*,

whether the Lecompton Constitution was or was not, in any just sense, made by the people of Kansas ; and in that quarrel the latter declares that all he wants is a fair vote for the people, and that he cares not whether slavery be voted *down* or voted *up*. I do not understand his declaration that he cares not whether slavery be voted down or voted up, to be intended by him other than as apt definition of the policy he would impress upon the public mind—the principle for which he declares he has suffered so much, and is ready to suffer to to the end. And well may he cling to the principle. If he has any parental feeling, well may he cling to it. That principle is the only shred left of his original Nebraska doctrine. Under the Dred Scott decision “squatter sovereignty” squatted out of existence, tumbled down like temporary scaffolding—like the mould at the foundry served through one blast and fell back into loose sand—helped to carry an election, and then was kicked to the winds. His late joint struggle with the Republicans against the Lecompton Constitution, involves nothing of the original Nebraska doctrine. That struggle was made on a point—the right of a people to make their own constitution—upon which he and the Republicans have never differed.

The several points of the Dred Scott decision, in connection with Senator Douglas's “care not” policy, constitute the piece of machinery, in its present state of advancement. This was the third point.

gained. The working points of that machinery are :

First, That no negro slave, imported as such from Africa, and no descendant of such slave, can ever be a citizen of any State, in the sense of that term as used in the Constitution of the United States. This point is made in order to deprive the negro, in every possible event, of the benefit of that provision of the United States Constitution, which declares that "The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States."

Secondly, That "subject to the Constitution of the United States," neither Congress nor a Territorial Legislature can exclude slavery from any United States territory. This point is made in order that individual men may fill up the Territories with slaves, without danger of losing them a property, and thus to enhance the chances of permanency to the institution through all the future.

Thirdly, That whether the holding a negro in actual slavery in a free State, makes him free, as against the holder, the United States Courts will not decide, but will have to be decided by the Courts of any slave State the negro may be forced into by the master. This point is made, not to be pressed immediately; but, if acquiesced in for a while, and apparently indorsed by the people at an election then to sustain the logical conclusion that what Dred Scott's master might lawfully do with Dred Scott, in the free State of Illinois, every

other master may lawfully do with any other one, or one thousand slaves, in Illinois, or in any other free State.

Auxiliary to all this, and working hand in hand with it, the Nebraska doctrine, or what is left of it, is to educate and mould public opinion, at least Northern public opinion, not to care whether slavery is voted down or voted up. This shows exactly where we now are; and partially also, whither we are tending.

It will throw additional light on the latter, to go back, and run the mind over the string of historical facts already stated. Several things will now appear less dark and mysterious than they did when they were transpiring. The people were to be left "perfectly free," "subject only to the Constitution." What the Constitution had to do with it, outsiders could not then see. Plainly enough now, it was an exactly fitted niche, for the Dred Scott decision to afterward come in, and declare the perfect freedom of the people to be just no freedom at all. Why was the amendment expressly declaring the right of the people, voted down? Plainly enough now: the adoption of it would have spoiled the niche for the Dred Scott decision. Why was the court decision held up? Why even a Senator's individual opinion withheld, till after the Presidential election? Plainly enough now: the speaking out then would have damaged the perfectly free argument upon which the election was to be carried. Why the outgoing President's felicitation on the indorsement? Why the delay of a

re-argument? Why the incoming President's advance exhortation in favor of the decision? These things look like the cautious patting and petting of a spirited horse preparatory to mounting him, when it is dreaded that he may give the rider a fall. And why the hasty after-indorsement of the decision by the President and others?

We cannot absolutely know that all these exact adaptations are the result of pre concert. But when we see a lot of framed timbers, different portions of which we know have been gotten out at different times and places and by different workmen—Stephen, Franklin, Roger and James, for instance—and when we see these timbers joined together, and see they exactly make the frame of a house or a mill, all the tenons and mortises exactly fitting, and all the lengths and proportions of the different pieces exactly adapted to their respective places, and not a piece too many or too few—not omitting even scaffolding—or, if a single piece be lacking, we see the place in the frame exactly fitted and prepared yet to bring such piece in—in such a case, we find it impossible not to believe that Stephen, Franklin, Roger and James all understood one another from the beginning, and all worked upon a common plan or draft drawn up before the first blow was struck.

It should not be overlooked that, by the Nebraska bill, the people of a *State* as well as a Territory, were to be left "perfectly

free," "subject only to the Constitution." Why mention a State? They were legislating for Territories, and not for or about States. Certainly the people of a State are and ought to be subject to the Constitution of the United States; but why is mention of this lugged into this merely Territorial law? Why are the people of a Territory and the people of a State therein lumped together, and their relation to the Constitution therein treated as being precisely the same? While the opinion of the court, by Chief Justice Taney, in the Dred Scott case, and the separate opinions of all the concurring Judges, expressly declare that the Constitution of the United States neither permits Congress nor a Territorial Legislature to exclude slavery from any United States Territory, they all omit to declare whether or not the same Constitution permits a State, or the people of a State, to exclude it. *Possibly*, this is a mere omission; but who can be quite sure, if McLean or Curtis had sought to get into the opinion a declaration of unlimited power in the people of a State to exclude slavery from their limits just as Chase and Mace sought to get such declaration, in behalf of the people of a Territory, into the Nebraska bill;—I ask, who can be quite sure that it would not have been voted down in the one case as it had been in the other? The nearest approach to the point of declaring the power of a State over slavery, is made by Judge Nelson. He approaches it more than once, using the precise idea, and almost the language too, of

the Nebraska act. On one occasion, his exact language is "except in cases where the power is restrained by the Constitution of the United States, the law of the State is supreme over the subject of slavery within its jurisdiction." In what cases the power of the States is so restrained by the United States Constitution, is left an open question, precisely as the same question, as to the restraint on the power of the Territories, was left open in the Nebraska act. Put this and that together, and we have another nice little niche, which we may, ere long, see filled with another Supreme Court decision, declaring that the Constitution of the United States does not permit a *State* to exclude slavery from its limits. And this may especially be expected if the doctrine of "care not whether slavery be voted down or voted up," shall gain upon the public mind sufficiently to give promise that such a decision can be maintained when made.

Such a decision is all that slavery now lacks of being alike lawful in all the States. Welcome, or unwelcome, such decision is probably coming, and will soon be upon us unless the power of the present political dynasty shall be met and overthrown. We shall lie down pleasantly dreaming that the people of Missouri are on the verge of making their State free, and we shall awake to the reality instead, that the Supreme Court has made Illinois a slave State. To meet and overthrow the power of that dynasty, is the work now before all those who would prevent that consumma-

tion. That is what we have to do. How can we be t do it?

There are those who denounce us openly to their own friends, and yet whisper us softly, that Senator Douglas is the ptest in-tument there is with which to affect that object. They wish us to "infer" all, from the fact that he now has a little quarrel with the present head of the dynasty ; and that he has regularly voted with us on a single point upon which he and we have never differed. They remind us that he is a great man, and that the lar-es of us are very small ones. Let this be granted. But "a living dog is better than a dead lion." Judge Douglas, if not a de d lion for this work, is at least a caged and toothless one. How can he oppose the advances of slavery? He don't care any thing about it. His avowed mission is impressing the "public hear" to *care nothing about it*. A leading Douglas democratic newspaper thinks Douglas' superior talent will be needed to resist the revival of the African slave trade. Does Douglas believe an effort to revive that trade is approaching? He has not said so. Does he really think so? But if it is, how can he resist it? For years he has labored to prove it a sacred right of white men to take negro slaves into the new Territories. Can e possibly show that it is less a sacred right to buy them where they can be bought cheapest? And unquestionably they can be bought cheaper in Africa than in Virginia. He

has done all in his power to reduce the whole question of slavery to one of a mere right of property ; and as such, how can he oppose the foreign slave trade—how can he refuse that trade in that “property” shall be “perfectly free”—unless he does it as a protection to the home production ? And as the home producers will probably not ask the protection, he will be wholly without a ground of opposition.

Senator Douglas holds, we know, that a man may rightfully be wiser to-day than he was yesterday—that he may rightfully change when he finds himself wrong. But can we, for that reason, run ahead, and infer that he will make any particular change, of which he, himself, has given no intimation ? Can we safely base our action upon any such vague inference ? Now, as ever, I wish not to misrepresent Judge Douglas's position, question his motives, or do aught that can be personally offensive to him. Whenever, if ever, he and we can come together on principle so that our cause may have assistance from his great ability, I hope to have interposed no adventitious obstacle. But clearly, he is not now with us—he does not pretend to be—he does not promise ever to be.

Our cause, then, must be intrusted to, and conducted by, its own undoubted friends—those whose hands are free, whose hearts are in the work—who “do care” for the result. Two years ago the Republicans of the nation mustered over thirteen hundred thousand strong. We did this under the single impulse of resistance

to a common danger, with every external circumstance against us. Of strange, discordant, and even hostile elements, we gathered from the four winds, and formed and fought the battle through, under the constant hot fire of a disciplined, proud and pampered enemy. Did we brave all then, to falter now?—now, when that same enemy is wavering, dissevered and beligerent? The results is not doubtful. We shall not fail—if we stand firm, we “shall not fail.” Wise counsels may accelerate, or mistakes delay it, but, sooner or later, the victory is sure to come.

SPEECH OF HON. ABR'M LINCOLN

Delivered in Springfield, Saturday evening, July 17, 1858. (Mr. Douglas not present.)

FELLOW-CITIZENS:—Another election, which is deemed an important one, is approaching, and, as I suppose, the Republican party will, without much difficulty, elect their State Ticket. But in regard to the Legislature, we the Republicans, labor under some disadvantages. In the first place, we have a Legislature to elect upon an apportionment of the representation made several years ago, when the proportion of the population was far greater in the South (as compared with the North) than it now is; and inasmuch as our opponents hold entire sway in the South, and we a correspondingly large majority in the North, the fact that we are to be represented as we were years ago, when the population was different, is, to us a very great disadvantage. We had in the year 1855, according to law, a census or enumeration of the inhabitants, taken for the purpose of a new apportionment of representation. We

know what a fair apportionment of representation upon that census would give us. We know that it could not, if fairly made, fail to give the Republican party from six to ten more members of the Legislature than they can probably get as the law now stands. It so happened at the last session of the Legislature, that our opponents, holding the control of both branches of the Legislature, refused to give us such an apportionment as we were rightly entitled to have upon the census already taken. The Legislature would pass no bill upon that subject, except such as was at least as unfair to us as the old one, and in which, in some instances, two men in the Democratic regions were allowed to go so far toward sending a member to the Legislature as there were in the Republican regions. Comparison was made at the time as to representative and senatorial districts, which completely demonstrated that such was the fact.— Such a bill was passed and tendered to the Republican Governor for his signature; but principally for the reasons I have stated, he withheld his approval, and the bill fell without becoming a law.

Another disadvantage under which we labor is, that there are one or two Democratic Senators who will be members of the next Legislature, and will vote for the election of Senator, who are holding over in districts in which we could, in all reasonable calculation, elect men of our own, if we only had the chance of an election. When we consider that there are but twenty-five Senators in the Senate, taking two from the side where they rightfully belong and adding them to the other, is to us a disadvantage not to be lightly regarded. Still, so it is; we have this to contend with. Perhaps there is no ground for complaint on our part. In attending to the many things involved in the last general election for President, Governor, Auditor, Treasurer, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Members of Congress, of the Legislature, County Officers, and so on, we allowed these things to happen by want of sufficient attention, and we have no cause to complain of our adversaries, so far as this matter is concerned. But we have some cause to complain of the refusal to give us a fair apportionment.

There is still another disadvantage under which we labor, and to which I will ask your attention. It arises out of the relative positions of the two persons who stand before the State as candidates for the Senate. Senator Douglas is of world-wide renown. All the anxious politicians of his party, or who have been of his party for years past, have been looking upon him as certainly, at no distant day, to be the President of the United States. They have seen in his round, jolly, fruitful face, post-offices, land-offices, marshalls and cabinet-appointments, chargeships and foreign missions, bursting and sprouting out in wonderful exuberance, ready to be laid hold of by their greedy hands. And as they have been gazing upon this attractive picture so long, they cannot, in the little distraction that has taken place in the party, bring themselves to give up the charming hope; but with greedier anxiety they rush about him, sustain him, give him marches, triumphal entries, and receptions beyond what even in the days of his highest prosperity they could have brought about in his favor. On the contrary, nobody has ever

expected me to be President. In my poor, lean, lank face, nobody has ever seen that any cabbages were sprouting out. These are disadvantages all, taken together, that the Republicans labor under. We have to fight this battle upon principle alone. I am, in a certain sense, made the standard-bearer in behalf of the Republic. I was made so merely because there had to be some one so placed—I being in nowise preferable to any other one of the twenty-five, perhaps a hundred we have in the Republican ranks. Then I say I wish it to be distinctly understood and borne in mind, that we have to fight this battle without many—perhaps without any—of the external aids which are brought to bear against us. So I hope those with whom I am surrounded have principle enough to nerve themselves for the task and leave nothing undone, that can be fairly done, to bring about the right result.

After Senator Douglas left Washington, as his movements were made known by the public prints, he tarried a considerable time in the city of New York; and it was heralded that, like another Napoleon, he was

lying by and framing the plan of his campaign. It was telegraphed to Washington City, and published in the Union, that he was framing his plan for the purpose of going to Illinois to pounce upon and annihilate the treasonable and disunion speech which Lincoln had made here on the 16th of June. Do you suppose that the Judge really spent some time maturing the plan of the campaign, as his friends heralded for him. I have been able, by noting his movements since his arrival in Illinois, to discover evidences confirmatory of that allegation. I think I have been able to see what are the material points of that plan. I will, for a little while, ask your attention to some of them. What I shall point out, though not showing the whole plan, are, nevertheless, the main points, as I suppose.

They are not very numerous. The first is Popular Sovereignty. The second and third are attacks upon my speech made on the 16th of June. Out of these three points—drawing within the range of popular sovereignty the question of the Lecompton Constitution—he makes his principal assault. Upon these his successive speeches are substantially

one and the same. On this matter of popular sovereignty I wish to be a little careful. Auxiliary to these main points, to be sure, are their thunderings of cannon, their marching and music, their fizzle-gigs and fire-works; but I will not waste time with them. They are but the little trappings of the campaign.

Coming to the substance—the first point—“popular sovereignty.” It is to be labeled upon the cars in which he travels; put upon the hacks he rides in; to be flaunted upon the arches he passes under, and the banners which wave over him. It is to be dished up in as many varieties as a French cook can produce soups from potatoes. Now, as this is so great a plan of the campaign, it is worth while to examine it carefully; and if we examine only a very little, and do not allow ourselves to be misled, we shall be able to see that the whole thing is the most arrant Quixotism that was ever enacted before a community. What is the matter of popular sovereignty? The first thing, in order to understand it, is to get a good definition of what it is, and after that to see how it is applied.

I suppose almost every one knows

that, in this controversy, whatever has been said has had reference to the question of negro slavery. We have not been in a controversy about the right of the people to govern themselves in the ordinary matters of domestic concern in the States and Territories. Mr. Buchanan, in one of his late messages (I think when he sent up the Lecompton Constitution) urged that the main points to which the public attention had been directed, was not in regard to the great variety of small domestic matters, but was directed to the question of negro slavery; and he asserts, that if the people had had a fair chance to vote on that question, there was no reasonable ground of objection in regard to minor questions. Now, while I think that the people had not had given, or offered them, a fair chance upon that slavery question; still, if there had been a fair submission to a vote, upon the main question, the President's proposition would have been true to the uttermost. Hence, when hereafter I speak of popular sovereignty, I wish to be understood as applying what I say to the question of slavery only, not to other minor domestic matters of a Territory or a State.

Does Judge Douglas, when he says that several of the past years of his life have been devoted to the question of "popular sovereignty," and that all the remainder of his life shall be devoted to it, does he mean to say that he has been devoting his life to securing to the people of the Territories the right to exclude slavery from the 'Territories? If he means so to say, he means to deceive; because he and every one knows that the decision of the Supreme Court, which he approves and makes especial ground of attack upon me for disapproving, forbids the people of a Territory to exclude slavery. This covers the whole ground, from the settlement of a Territory till it reaches the degree of maturity entitling it to form a State Constitution. So far as all that ground is concerned, the Judge is not sustaining popular sovereignty, but absolutely opposing it. He sustains the decision which declares that the popular will of the Territories has no constitutional power to exclude slavery during their Territorial existence. This being so, the period of time from the first settlement of a Territory till it reaches the point of forming a State

Constitution, is not the thing that the Judge has fought for or is fighting for, but, on the contrary, he has fought for, and is fighting for, the thing that annihilates and crushes out that same popular sovereignty.

Well, so much being disposed of, what is left? Why, he is contending for the right of the people, when they come to make a State Constitution, to make it for themselves, and precisely as best suits themselves. I say again, that is Quixotic. I defy contradiction when I declare that the Judge can find no one to oppose him on that proposition. I repeat, there is nobody opposing that proposition on principle. Let me not be misunderstood. I know that, with reference to the Lecompton Constitution, I may be misunderstood; but, when you understand me correctly, my proposition will be true and accurate. Nobody is opposing, or has opposed, the right of the people, when they form a Constitution, to form it for themselves. Mr. Buchanan and his friends have not done it; they, too, as well as the Republicans and the Anti-Lecompton Democrats, have not done it; but, on the contrary, they together have insisted on the right of the

people to form a Constitution for themselves. The difference between the Buchanan men on the one hand, and the Douglas men and the Republicans on the other, has not been on a question of principle, but on a question of fact.

The dispute was upon the question of fact, whether the Lecompton Constitution had been fairly formed by the people or not. Mr. Buchanan and his friends have not contended for the contrary principle any more than the Douglas men or the Republicans. They have insisted that whatever of small irregularities existed in getting up the Lecompton Constitution, were such as happen in the settlement of all new Territories. The question was, was it a fair emanation of the people? It was a question of fact and not of principle. As to the principle, all were agreed. Judge Douglas voted with the Republicans upon that matter of fact.

He and they, by their voices and votes, denied that it was a fair emanation of the people. The administration affirmed that it was. With respect to the evidence bearing upon that question of fact, I readily agree that Judge Douglas and the

Republicans had the right on their side, and that the Administration was wrong. But I state again that, as a matter of principle, there is no dispute upon the right of a people in a Territory, merging into a State to form a Constitution for themselves without outside interference from any quarter. This being so, what is Judge Douglas going to spend his life for? Is he going to spend his life in maintaining a principle that nobody on earth opposes? Does he expect to stand up in majestic dignity, and go through his apotheosis and become a god, in the maintaining of a principle which neither man nor mouse in all God's creation is opposing? Now something in regard to the Lecompton Constitution more specially; for I pass from this other question of popular sovereignty as the most ar-rant humbug that has ever been attempted on an intelligent community.

As to the Lecompton Constitution, I have already said that on the question of fact as to whether it was a fair emanation of the people or not, Judge Douglas with the Republicans and some Americans had greatly the argument against the

Administration; and while I repeat this, I wish to know what there is in the opposition of Judge Douglas to the Lecompton Constitution that entitles him to be considered the only opponent to it—as being par excellence the quintessence of that opposition. I agree to the rightfulness of his opposition. He in the Senate and his class of men there formed the number of three and no more. In the House of Representatives his class of men—the Anti-Lecompton Democrats—formed a number of about twenty. It took one hundred and twenty to defeat the measure, against one hundred and twelve. Of the votes of that one hundred and twenty, Judge Douglas's friends furnished twenty, to add to which there were six Americans and ninety-four Republicans. I do not say that I am precisely accurate in their numbers, but I am sufficiently so for any use I am making of it.

Reuben Vose's Publications.

Reuben Vose, No. 45 Malden Lane, is now publishing 10,000 copies of the *Lives and Speeches of Lincoln and Hamlin*. Price 15 cents.

Also, 5000 copies of the *Conservative*. Price 15 cents. The *Conservative* is a political work for the campaign, and contains the names of five hundred of the richest men in New-York.

Also, 1000 copies of "The Union Speeches". Price 15 cents.

Also 1000 copies of the most eloquent Republican speeches of the whole country. Price 15 cents.

Also, 2000 copies of the *Astor Papers*. Price 50 cents. The *Astor papers* have a superbly-engraved map, 17 inches by 27 inches, elegantly engraved by one of the first firms in this city, Messrs Miller & Boyle, No. 142 Broadway. This superb map shows all the most interesting events of that inhospitable region, including the freezing of Sir John Franklin—Captain Crozier—Sir Hugh Willoughby, and three hundred men! The *Astor Papers* have a fac-simile of the "Death Warrant" of Charles I., King of England. This record of a bloody "Fanaticism" was lost or mislaid, in the Tower of England, and by historians was supposed to be forever lost. This "Death Warrant" is signed by Oliver Cromwell—by the three Regicides, Bradshaw, Goffe, Whaley, who

escaped to this country and died at New-Haven—by Ireton, the son-in-law of Cromwell—by Scroope, the Chancellor—by Thomas Grey, Michael Livesey, John Okey, John Danvers, John Bourcher, Thomas Maleverer, John Blackiston, John Hutchinson, Thomas Pride, Peter Temple, Thomas Harrison, John Huson, Henry Smith, Peregrine Pelham, Simon Meyn. Thomas Horton, John Jones, John More, Hardress Waller, Gilbert Millington, George Fleetwood, John Alured, Robert Lilburn, William Say, Anthony Stapely, Richard Deane, Robert Tichburne, Humphrey Edwards, Daniel Blagrove, Owen Roe, William Purefoy, James Temple, Augustine Garland, Edmond Ludlow, Henry Martin, Vincent Potter, William Constable, Richard Ingoldsby, William Cawley, John Burstead, Isaac Ewers, John Dixwell, Valentine Walton, Gregory Norton, Thomas Chaloner, Thomas Wogan, John Ven, Gregory Clement, John Downs, Thomas Wayte, Thomas Scot, John Carew, Miles Corbet.” Hundreds of our most wealthy families claim ancestry from these early Puritans; one of these is in our books at \$2,00,000, and one other at \$1,000,000.

As a specimen of early Puritan penmanship (truly beautiful) it is unequalled—in the interest of its associations—by any record of English history. This “Death Warrant” is copied from the one now in possession of Reuben Vose, valued by him at one thousand dollars—it is two hundred and twelve years old.

Col. Hoe, (the collector of everything

curious,) is the only person to whom Reuben Vose has promised a photographic copy. The Astor Papers contain the first part of the Courtenay Conspiracy, or the trial of Queen Caroline, wife of George IV., and mother of Queen Charlotte. Charlotte died giving birth to an heir to the throne of England. The charges against the Queen were for criminal connection with Sir Sidney Smith, and for being mother of a child—*not entitled to the throne of England*. The question involved was the very important one, "Is William Austin the son of the Queen by her husband, George IV? If he is, then Charlotte is not the legitimate heir to the throne."

Seven hundred thousand copies of the Trial of the Queen Caroline, written in four languages, were sold in Europe. The next number of the Astor Papers will have a sketch of Japan, selected from one of the most recent works on that singular nation. I offer for sale one thousand copies of Reuben Vose's new Lawyer, or Law for the People. 447 pages. Price one dollar, bound in law book style in leather.

I offer for sale 1500 copies of The Wealth of the World Displayed; containing the names of the most wealthy men in the world. 257 pages. Price 62 cents.

I am preparing a Directory of the names of the RESPONSIBLE merchants in the principal cities of the thirty-three States. Each book will be delivered to subscribers ONLY, and under lock and key.

D

Price five dollars. Each book will include the names of one city only.

Advertisements of one page will be inserted in 5000 copies of any of these books for five dollars, which is equal to ten pages for one cent. All the news agents will sell my books at my lowest wholesale prices.

Reuben Vose's New Path Finder will be sent every six months to every—RESPONSIBLE—merchant, both South and West—FREE OF CHARGE!

REUBEN VOSE,
45 Malden Lane.

Reuben Vose, I consider your engraved map of the Polar Regions one of the best yet published. HENRY GRINNELL.

I agree with Mr. Grinnell.

EGBERT L. VIELE,
Civil Engineer.

I agree with Mr. Grinnell and Mr. Viele.

HAMILTON EWING,
Brooklyn City Surveyor.

Reuben Vose, Your map of the Polar Sea shows every place visited by Dr. Kane and myself.

I. I. HAYES, M.D.

Reuben Vose, We consider the "Death Warrant" of Charles I., King of England, now in your possession, a great curiosity.

D. T. VALENTINE,
Clerk of the Common Council.

I agree with Mr. Valentine.

R. M. HOR.

HAMILTON EWEEN,

City Engineer of Brooklyn,

CIVIL AND TOPOGRAPHICAL ENGINEER,

OFFICE..... No. 13 Broadway, N. Y.

RESIDENCE..... No. 268 Second St., Brooklyn, E. D.

**PAPER HANGINGS,
WINDOW SHADES, TABLE COVERS,
Picture and Shade Tassels,
PATENT FIXTURES, CORNICES,
White and Buff Hollands.**

The Largest Assortment in the City

WILL BE FOUND AT

PARTRIDGE, PINCHOT & WARREN'S

No. 6 Courtlandt St.